

placed. I grieve over that, because it is difficult for a man to foresee these emotional shocks in these trying and difficult days.

For example, I had hoped that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would lead the fight to strike down the dangerous beast called unemployment. When the proposed legislation for area redevelopment and unemployment compensation, for public works, for small business and expansion, and many other fine programs, was offered, much of which had to be cut back because of the combination of conservative opposition in the Senate, I was hopeful that our Republican friends would stand with us as the defenders of the Republic, the protectors of the good life, the champions of full employment. I was hopeful that they would help us to overcome these difficulties.

But alas and alack, we received little or no help. Despite that, we did better than our predecessors. That is not much of a standard by which to measure oneself, but we did a little better than those who preceded us.

Mr. MORTON. Many of us Republicans stood by the Democrats. Considered by Republican standards, the Democrats have a workable majority in this body. The fact that the Democrats cannot make their programs succeed is not the fault of the Republicans. If we had as much of a majority as the Democrats have, or even half as much, in my opinion we would make some of the programs work.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, have been wrong. I was even so wrong that I organized Willkie clubs in 1940 and thought we were going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was pretty wrong.

Mr. MORTON. I was wrong in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So was I. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the repayment of the debt to West Virginia has so far consisted of the presentation of an autographed copy of "Profiles in Courage" to the library at St. Albans. I know that some of my coal mine friends there find the situation today worse than it was when the Senator from Minnesota made his heroic, courageous effort in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to add the word "futile," too?

Mr. MORTON. No; I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service. In all fairness and honesty, I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service.

However, because the Senator from Minnesota is so understanding, has such a keen sense of humor, and is one of the great Members of this body, one who can "take it" as well as "dish it out," I could not help reminding him of our joint appearance on "Meet the Press," when he so adamantly said that unemployment would be a page in history by the time the calendar year had ended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that the Senator from Kentucky has been so kind as to remind me of that statement once, I hope he will forget it from here on out. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota has spoken of unrequited hope. I wonder if he remembers the somewhat well known quatrain in poetry, which has become somewhat moth-eaten by now:

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;  
The eternal years of God are hers;  
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,  
And dies among his worshippers.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that that is an apt characterization of the two political parties—the party of hope and the party of error?

Mr. MORTON. It is simply a question of which is which. I am the one who needs hope now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that confession. [Laughter.] This is one of the signs of the rebirth of the Republican Party—when Republicans speak with such sincerity of hope. I wish to commend the Senator. [Laughter.]

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1963:

##### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Karriek Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1963:

##### AMBASSADORS

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

##### WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

#### U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

#### IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward Gilson Curtis to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Miss Catherine Van Lier Ribbink to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rabbi Albert Shulman, national chaplain, the American Legion, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Life is essentially a matter of human relations. Human relations is the art of living together. And living together is a matter of sharing our love, our talents, and our blessings for the betterment of mankind. These are embodied in the general welfare of our country and our people.

Through the wise use of the mind and the heart, our America can be made into the great dream that vests every man with dignity, freedom, and promise.

We are grateful that this body of lawmakers is dedicated to the principle that only freemen living in a free society can live with dignity, freedom, and promise. We are grateful that we have fashioned a nation in which every individual is considered a child of God, and every human being is entitled to share the blessings of our American way of life.

May our America always stand for all that is good, just, and right. May our America always be the symbol of man's eternal struggle to achieve the good life. May our America always stand for a grateful people ever mindful of the many treasures that make up our American way of life. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator

from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The White House, March 11, 1963.

#### MANPOWER REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The White House,

Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am transmitting herewith my manpower report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies, and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

#### CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

#### LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

#### AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

#### ENVOY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF AN ELECTRONICS, INSTRUMENTATION, AND MATERIALS LABORATORY AT MISSISSIPPI TEST FACILITY

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at the Mississippi Test Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical Space Sciences.

#### REPORT ON REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF LOAD TEST ANNEX AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law on the reprogramming of funds relating to the construction of a load test annex at the Marshall Space Flight Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

#### REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the armed forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period July-December 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.



#### AUDIT REPORT ON U.S. STUDY COMMISSION ON CERTAIN RIVER BASINS, STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas, for the period August 28, 1958, through August 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED BY SANDIA CORP., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque, N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO IMPROVE THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSFERS AND CONVEYANCES OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1825, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN WITNESS' FEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS TO CLASSIFY STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department

of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### INCREASE OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUING WORK IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial of the senate and house of representatives requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 75 percent

"Whereas in recognition of the heavy interstate traffic on highways built and maintained by the various States, the Federal Government now contributes 50 percent of the total costs of construction on highways designated as Federal aid primary highways; and

"Whereas in recognition of the additional financial burden which would be placed on the various States having large areas of land owned by the Federal Government, an additional payment is made, in the case of Montana about 7 percent, to compensate for the Federal lands; and

"Whereas having a large area, sparse population, and being a bridge State for interstate traffic, Montana highways contribute a great deal to the welfare and pleasure of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas due to these conditions, the citizens of Montana must make very high per capita contributions to build and maintain this system; and

"Whereas the additional 7 percent contribution now made by the Federal Government for Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways is entirely inadequate to cover the costs of construction and maintenance borne by Montana as a result of heavy interstate traffic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Legislative Assembly of Montana hereby respectfully requests that Congress take action to increase the additional payment made to Montana for Federal aid primary highways from 7 to 20 percent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to each member of the Montana Highway Commission.

"DAVID F. JAMES,  
"President of the Senate."  
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable JAMES BATTIN and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this Act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitations are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one man can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one man can handle; and

"Whereas the area above Canyon Ferry Reservoir on the Missouri River is at high elevations which limits the crops to stock raising purposes, requiring large acreages for a balanced economy; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the area above Canyon Ferry to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in this area, the acreage allowed in a single holding often must be greater than 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana as follows:

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the area above Canyon Ferry in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions.

"4. That the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana; to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United

States; and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN and the Honorable JAMES BATTIN, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

"DAVID F. JAMES,  
President of the Senate."

"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the authority to apportion the legislative body of each State properly belongs to the legislative assembly, or to the people of that State, and

"Whereas through its decision in *Baker v. Carr* the Supreme Court of the United States has attempted to extend the judicial power of the courts into an area which is traditionally, properly, and constitutionally a prerogative of the legislative branch of State government.

"Whereas article V of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress, 'on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the legislative assembly petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

#### "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. The Judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

"DAVID F. JAMES,  
President of the Senate."

"Speaker of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

"Resolution of the West Virginia Legislature making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia

"Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

"Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil

of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

"Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

"Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "RESOLUTION 3

"A resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to outlaw the poll tax

"Whereas, both Houses of the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

#### "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation": Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

"The secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and transmit an official notice of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States as provided by the law of this State.

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"A. W. KEITH,

"President of the Senate."

"Passed the house of representatives this 19th day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"G. H. LEAHY,

"Chief Clerk,

"House of Representatives."

"Passed the senate this 27th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"Secretary of the Senate."

"Approved March 6, 1963.

"ELMER L. ANDERSEN,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

#### "SENATE RESOLUTION 190

"A Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound.

"Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

"Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

"Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on mid-dling one inch upland cotton as thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

"Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate: That the Members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "SENATE RESOLUTION 11

"A resolution petitioning the President of the United States to reject reports favoring relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil

"Whereas the mining of bituminous coal is one of Kentucky's major industries, and, as such, contributes substantially to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and particularly to the economic well-being of thousands of Kentuckians whose livelihood is dependent upon the coal, railroad, and related industries; and

"Whereas the coal industry in Kentucky and elsewhere is now and has been for some time in a depressed condition, which would be further compounded by any cause which would lessen coal's ability to compete in the fuels market; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil (waste) in an increasingly excessive volume at unrealistic prices has adversely affected coal's competitive position, and, thereby, has been and is now responsible for the displacement of millions of tons of American coal, and, hence, thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of wages to workers; and,

"Whereas the President of the United States has received a report from the Office of Emergency Planning recommending that there be a gradual relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil; and

"Whereas the supporting reason given by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is that such relaxation will not adversely affect the security of this Nation; and

"Whereas this supporting reason is based on the statement that, in conventional-type



warfare, oil tankers from Central and South America could deliver crude and residual oil to the east coast, which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify and substantiate, especially if the experience to the contrary in World War II, when Germany with only 75 submarines did great damage to oil tankers in the Atlantic Ocean, is projected to the present-day situation with Russia having a reported 600 or more modern submarines: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That the senate, in special session assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States to completely reject the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil, and, further, that he utilize existing legislative authority to implement a program which will keep these imports within limitations that will permit domestic coal and oil to maintain production at a level which will protect the security and economy of this Nation, and thereby halt further economic hardship upon the coal industry, the coal-hauling railroads and related industries, and upon the Kentuckians and other Americans whose employment is provided by these industries; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.*

*"Attest:*

*"JOHN W. WILLIS,  
"Clerk of Senate."*

A resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

#### "HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

"A resolution respectfully urging the U.S. Senate to pass the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the U.S. Senate is considering a proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas a serious problem has been created by the 1 million youths from the ages of 16 to 22 years that are out of school and unemployed; and

"Whereas these young people lack the necessary skills to obtain employment; and

"Whereas the seriousness of the situation is evidenced by the actions of the President and the testimony of five Cabinet officers who appeared before the Senate labor subcommittee urging passage of the bill; and

"Whereas the program would provide training for approximately 1,800 of Kentucky's unemployed youths: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky: That the U.S. Senate be and hereby is respectfully urged to pass the Youth Conservation Corps bill; and that the clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to Kentucky's U.S. Senators and to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

*"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:*

*"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the*

*world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for the long-range future; and*

*"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and*

*"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and*

*"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and*

*"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has been making engineering, water resource, and land classification studies which have indicated economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and*

*"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it*

*"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.*

*"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 21st day of February 1963.*

*"W. E. DREYLOW,  
"President of the Senate.*

*"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 25th day of February 1963.*

*"PETE T. CENARRUSA,  
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

*"Be it resolved, by the thirty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That we most re-*

*spectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:*

#### "ARTICLE —

*"SECTION 1. A \$350 billion limit to be set on the U.S. Federal Government indebtedness.*

*"SEC. 2. Upon a declaration of a national emergency, approved by 75 percent of the House and Senate, this debt limit can be temporarily extended but the amount of debt temporarily extended must be retired within 10 years after the cessation of hostilities or declaration of an emergency.*

*"SEC. 3. All national debt commencing with the year 1970, whatever the sum, as of July 1, 1970, shall be retired at the rate of \$3 billion a year in addition to payments of interest.*

*"SEC. 4. The national debt limit of \$350 billion may be raised beyond said sum, upon being approved by Congress and ratified by two-thirds of the States, exclusive of those amounts defined in section 2."*

*"The secretary of state is hereby directed to send duly authenticated copies of this memorial to the President and Clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress from the State of Idaho, and to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of the several States."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

*"Concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors*

*"Whereas the United States is proud to be considered one of the world's leading democracies, and Hawaii is equally proud to share in that great tradition; and*

*"Whereas the preservation of the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers requires the constant vigilance of an enlightened population; and*

*"Whereas there have been injustices in our country which demand the attention of our people and require action by those who have been entrusted with the authority to govern by the people; and*

*"Whereas one of the most flagrant injustices has been the artificial barrier to participation in the electoral process provided by the imposition of the poll tax in some of these United States; and*

*"Whereas the Congress of the United States has taken steps to remove one of these injustices by initiating an amendment to the Constitution of the United States through U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29 which reads as follows:*

#### "S.J. RES. 29

*"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors*

*"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:*

#### "ARTICLE —

*"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress,*

shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation": Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963 (the house of representatives concurring), That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in United States Senate Joint Resolution 29, dated August 27, 1962, be and it is hereby ratified; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.*

*"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.*

*"NELSON K. DOY,  
"President of the Senate.  
"SEI CHI HIRAI,  
"Clerk of the Senate.*

*"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.*

*"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,  
"Speaker, House of Representatives.  
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,  
"Clerk, House of Representatives."*

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the State of Hawaii possesses a history and development unlike that of other States in the United States; and

"Whereas the United States of America through its Congress and its Department of Interior has seen fit to recognize this unique history; and

"Whereas Congress has implemented this recognition by the appropriation of \$175,000 for the restoration of the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Service has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas this project will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles, for the enlightenment and education of our own people as well as our visitors; and

"Whereas this project is also providing employment for a great number of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, That sincere appreciation and Aloha be extended to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."*

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

#### "SENATE RESOLUTION 21

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

*"Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3738 introduced by the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.*

*"Passed by the senate March 4, 1963.*

*"FRANK PERATOVICH,  
"President of the Senate.*

*"Attest:*

*"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,  
"Secretary of the Senate."*

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marysville, Calif., protesting against the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, relating to the death of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries

"Whereas the production and sale of wheat forms a vital part of the economy of South Dakota;

"Whereas the countries now involved in the formation of the European Economic Community—including West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—represent one of the best cash customers of U.S. wheatgrowers;

"Whereas there is a danger that the European Economic Community may develop policies which would curtail the importation of U.S. wheat;

"Whereas the adoption of protectionist and inward-directed trade restricting agricultural policies would seriously damage the economy of South Dakota and other major wheat growing States of the Great Plains and would greatly hamper the free exchange of goods between the United States and the Common Market countries; Be it

*"Resolved, That the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the U.S. Government to take all necessary steps to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries in line with the spirit of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Sec-*

retary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

*"Adopted by the Senate February 19, 1963.  
"Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 25, 1963.*

*"NILS A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.*

*"Attest:*

*"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker,  
"House of Representatives.*

*"Attest:*

*"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk,  
"House of Representatives."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

#### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency

"Whereas the State game, fish, and parks department, supplied with Federal matching funds, has and will continue to purchase wetlands and marshlands for the State of South Dakota for the purpose of protecting present breeding and feeding areas of migratory waterfowl;

"Whereas this State, vested with the titles to such lands as the game, fish, and parks department has purchased, provides to the several counties and their school districts, within which wetlands owned by the State of South Dakota are located, payments and grants in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has and will continue to purchase similar tracts of land for identical purposes and is not subject to county or school district tax levies or required to make payments in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the tax burden of the people of South Dakota and the landowners residing within the several counties and their school districts in which certain land titles are held by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the name of the Federal Government is necessarily increased in direct proportion to the amount of land purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Agency: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the senate concurring, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide payments in lieu of property taxes no longer able to be levied on those wetlands and marshlands acquired by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in order to equalize generally the tax burden of the citizens of the State of South Dakota and specifically the tax burden of the citizens of the several counties and their school districts; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen repre-*



sending the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house, February 16, 1963.

"Concurred in by the senate, February 25, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,  
"President of the Senate.  
"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker of the House.  
"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease

"Whereas singing at Mount Rushmore by student help at the concession is a source of enjoyment to the more than 1 million persons who annually visit the shrine of democracy; and

"Whereas the nonprofessional singing student waiters have voluntarily inaugurated this custom for their own pleasure and the enjoyment of those they serve without this being a part of their duties; and

"Whereas the figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt are symbolic of freedom and the democratic way of life; and

"Whereas impromptu singing by young people at work is a manifestation of the joys of freedom inherent to the United States and the free world; and

"Whereas this singing is an additional source of inspiration to all visitors in the true meaning of democracy as exemplified by this showplace of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, that in the interests of the millions who seek this inspiration at Mount Rushmore and as a source of encouragement to the youth of America to enjoy their freedom of choice of endeavor, the National Government allow this singing on a voluntary basis by nonprofessional student workers and remove the restrictions imposed in 1962; which caused it to cease; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward enrolled copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to U.S. Senators KARL MUNDT and GEORGE MCGOVERN, and to U.S. Congressmen E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL.

"Adopted by the senate February 23, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker,  
"House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk,  
"House of Representatives."

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is one of the outstanding recreation areas of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America has assisted greatly with development of the Black Hills as a recreation area through its program of national parks, shrines, and monuments; and

"Whereas continued development of the Black Hills is necessary so future generations can enjoy the same outdoor natural beauties as their predecessors; and

"Whereas one of the outstanding attractions of the future Black Hills development is being developed by a private group through the carving of Crazy Horse Memorial, a tribute to the heritage of the American Indian; and

"Whereas the Sioux Indians of South Dakota will benefit educationally, socially, and esthetically when the monument is completed; and

"Whereas funds from the self-supporting Crazy Horse carving on Thunder Mountain by Sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski are inadequate to complete the monument expeditiously: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and His Excellency the President to assist the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation Commission in speeding completion of the monument by providing funds to be repaid from admissions and concession sales during and after construction of the mountain carving; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to U.S. Senators KARL MUNDT and GEORGE MCGOVERN and to Congressmen E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL.

"Adopted by the senate, March 2, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker,  
"House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk,  
"House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the

foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of South Dakota have adopted as an integral part of their State constitution the following section in their bill of rights:

#### "Article VI—Bill of Rights

"Sec. 2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the sovereign State of South Dakota has implemented said section of the State constitution with statutory law to enforce this constitutional provision.

"Whereas 20 States in this Union have the same or similar constitutional or legislative enactments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request that the Congress of the United States refrain from any legislation abrogating the rights of the respective States in this field of civil rights; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to send out a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate February 21, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 28, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States election of the President and Vice President is by electors in the several States, appointed in each State as directed by its legislature, with each State having an elector for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the legislature in each State has directed that the appointment of its electors be by popular election on a statewide basis, a method that is not representative of the division of the voters within most of the States; and

"Whereas the whole body of electors (the electoral college) is the exact counterpart of a joint session of the two Houses of Congress in the representation of the States as units as well as the population of the States, and should be elected on a comparable basis so as to give the President and the whole Congress the same form of voting constituency; and

"Whereas the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States rest upon nationwide constituencies so altogether different as to make presidential U.S.A. and congressional U.S.A. two different countries within one national boundary: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to propose the article of amendment as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, now pending in the U.S. Senate, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, directed to the Secretary of each body; to the Members of Congress from this State; and to each house of the legislature of each of the other States.

"Adopted by the senate February 26, 1963.  
"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NILES A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:  
"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:  
"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

#### "SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81-874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.

"Whereas the program of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers for the construction on the Missouri River in central South Dakota of Oahe Dam, an important link in harnessing the upper Missouri River, necessitated a peak employment of thousands of skilled and unskilled personnel during the past decade, which caused the population of Fort Pierre, a small, historic community within immediate proximity to the dam construction site, to explode with the rapid influx of Federal and Federal-contractor employees, their wives, and, of immediate consequence to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, their children; and

"Whereas the housing patterns of Government and private personnel employed in the construction of Oahe Dam resulted in substantial numbers of mobile homes being moved into Fort Pierre, with relatively few permanent dwelling structures being constructed, while the school population increased by 234 percent, thereby decreasing the equity and effectiveness of the property tax, Fort Pierre's normal tool for financing education; and

"Whereas under Public Law 81-874, as amended, the Fort Pierre Independent School District received payments from the Federal Government to ameliorate the sudden and massive increase in school enrollments which continued through the past decade but which the Corps of Army Engineers discontinued upon the completion of Oahe Dam, no longer requiring the services of large numbers of personnel; and

"Whereas the completion of the construction of the Oahe Dam should have resulted in the community losing the temporary pop-

ulation gained in the beginning of the last decade, but with a similar dam being constructed only 66 highway miles downstream, many workers lingered in the community commuting to the new damsite, and continuing to educate their children in Fort Pierre schools, despite the school district's loss of impacted area funds; and

"Whereas the burden of supporting the community's educational facilities now rests entirely upon State aid and the property taxes paid by established, home owning and permanent community residents who are already taxed at the maximum constitutional amount and who have, lacking other alternatives, turned to the State for immediate and emergency assistance; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of South Dakota prohibits the State legislature from enacting special appropriations to relieve the plight of the Fort Pierre Independent School District; and

"Whereas the Federal Government remains the only remaining source of assistance and aid to solve the community's rapidly deteriorating school district financial condition arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and the subsequent and sudden withdrawal of financial support: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States, to take immediate and necessary action to recognize the ignored responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and provide financial relief, either through direct financial aid or an amendment to Public Law 81-874, as amended, to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak., to be effective until the construction employment patterns of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and its contractors no longer affect the enrollment of the school district; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Committee on Education of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the members of the South Dakota delegations to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate March 5, 1963.  
"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 6, 1963.

"NILES A. BOE,  
"Lieutenant Governor,  
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:  
"NIELS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate.  
"PAUL E. BROWN,  
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:  
"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 42).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor (Rept. No. 43); and

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense (Rept. No. 18).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance (Rept. No. 44); and

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters (Rept. No. 46);

S. Res. 13. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security operations (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 17. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 18. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and the civil service system (Rept. No. 45);

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964 (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 26. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 27. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to inter-agency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendment (Rept. No. 30);



S. Res. 58. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 59. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 65. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 66. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 67. Resolution to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 68. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 41); and

S. Res. 73. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 47).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) (Rept. No. 51);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Slat (Rept. No. 52);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Young Wai (Rept. No. 53);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro (Rept. No. 54);

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialogowski (Rept. No. 55);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Makris (Rept. No. 56);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez (Rept. No. 57);

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Roswitha Seib (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whiting (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen (Rept. No. 61);

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Ho Koon Chew (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Rataj (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration (Rept. No. 50).

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly.

# APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Public Works; Labor and Public Welfare; the Judiciary; and the Joint Economic Committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962*

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jennings Randolph: Mexico.....	Peso.....	400	31.10	140	11.20	900	72.40	528	42.30	1,968	158.00
Senator Ernest Gruening: Mexico.....	do.....	460	36.50	350	28.00	950	76.00	520	41.80	2,280	182.30
Theo W. Sneed: Mexico.....	do.....	350	28.00	200	16.00	800	64.10	430	34.40	1,780	142.50
Lorenzo E. Tapia: Mexico.....	do.....	460	36.50	350	28.00	800	64.10	330	26.50	1,940	155.50
Herbert W. Beaser: Mexico.....	do.....	350	28.00	100	8.00	800	64.10	237	19.00	1,487	119.10
Total.....			161.50		91.20		340.70		164.00		757.40

### RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 757.40

MARCH 4, 1963.

PAT McNAMARA,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

*Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962*

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pat McNamara: Switzerland.....	Franc.....	512	128	488	122	4,122	1,030.50			5,122	1,280.50
Total.....			128		122		1,030.50				1,280.50

### RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 1,280.50

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

LISTER HILL,  
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kenneth B. Keating:											
Austria.....	Schilling							165.90	6.83	165.90	6.83
Belgium.....	Franc	1,285	25.70			425	8.50	250	5.24	1,960	39.44
Germany.....	Deutsche mark							96	24.00	96	24.00
Italy.....	Lira					11,178	18.00			11,178	18.00
Nigeria.....	Nigerian pound							1/10/0	4.23	1/10/0	4.23
Poland.....	Zloty	1,115	44.60					407	18.82	1,522	63.42
United Kingdom.....	Pound					4/17/6	13.65			4/17/6	13.65
Netherlands.....	Dutch guilder					3934.17	1,094.65				1,094.65
Subtotal.....			70.30				1,134.80		59.12		1,264.22
Milton Eisenberg:											
Nigeria.....	Pound	17	48.00	7	20.00			2/2/5	6.00	26/2/5	74.00
Netherlands.....	Dutch guilder					3,496.96	973.00				973.00
Subtotal.....			48.00		20.00				6.00		1,047.00
Paul L. Laskin:											
France.....	Franc					5,438	1,109.74			5,438	1,109.74
Italy.....	Lira	47,330	76.20	21,000	33.82	3,870	6.23	10,800	17.40	83,000	133.65
Subtotal.....			76.20		33.82		1,115.97		17.40		1,243.39
Phyllis T. Piotrow:											
Germany.....	Deutsche mark	208.35	52.09	28.60	7.15	143	35.75	24.80	6.20	404.75	101.19
Italy.....	Lira	9,793	15.75	4,310	7.00	2,200	3.55	2,352	3.75	18,655	30.05
United Kingdom.....	Pound	18/1/10	50.65	2-2-10	6.00	1-19-6	5.55	1-4-11	3.50	23-9-1	65.70
Netherlands.....	Dutch guilder					2,425.95	2,675.00				2,675.00
Subtotal.....			118.49		20.15		719.85		13.45		871.94
Total.....			312.99		73.97		3,943.62		95.97		4,426.55

<sup>1</sup> Certain portions of this ticket were not used and refunds for such will be made by airlines. <sup>2</sup> Ticket not used; amount will be refunded by airline.

## RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount  
4,426.55

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths:											
Panama.....	Balboa	60	60.00	18.75	18.75			3	3.00	181.75	81.75
Costa Rica.....	Colón	350	52.60	203	30.50			145	21.80	1,698	104.90
Guatemala.....	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.55	13.55			5	5.00	136.95	36.95
Mexico.....	Peso	525	42.00	432	34.60	440.00	35.20	45.50	3.60	1,442.50	115.40
Netherlands.....	Guilder					1,513.8	420.50			1,513.8	420.50
Subtotal.....			173.00		97.40		455.70		33.40		759.50
Ann Cooper Penning:											
Panama.....	Balboa	60	60.00	16.70	16.70			3.35	3.35	180.05	80.05
Costa Rica.....	Colón	163.20	24.50	134.30	20.20			47	7.10	1,344.50	51.80
Guatemala.....	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	11.50	11.50			3	3.00	132.90	32.90
Mexico.....	Peso	525	42.00	420	33.60	365	29.20	37.90	3.10	1,347.90	107.90
West Germany.....	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.55			1,866	466.55
Subtotal.....			144.90		82.00		495.75		16.55		739.20
William H. Moore:											
Panama.....	Balboa	60	60.00	19.75	19.75			6	6.00	175.75	85.75
Costa Rica.....	Colón	163.20	24.50	126.20	19.00			45	6.90	1,334.50	50.40
Guatemala.....	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.50	13.50			6	6.00	137.90	37.90
Mexico.....	Peso	525	42.00	406	32.50	295	23.60	71	5.70	1,295	103.80
West Germany.....	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.50			1,866	466.50
Subtotal.....			144.90		84.75		490.10		24.60		744.35
Hon. Jacob K. Javits:											
Germany.....	Deutsche mark			60	15.00					100	25.00
Netherlands.....	Guilder					2,078.28	577.30	40	10.00	2,078.28	577.30
France.....	New franc			1,343.70	268.74					1,343.70	268.74
Total.....					283.74		577.30		10.00		871.04
Belle Notkin, France	do.	615.65	125.64	474.50	96.83	195	39.80	230.50	47.05	1,515.65	309.32
Ettore Lolli, Italy	Lira					125,000	201.29			125,000	201.29
Jurg Niehans, Switzerland	Franc					4,411	1,019.64	119.75	27.69	4,530.75	1,047.33
Alan Day, United Kingdom	Pound sterling	35-0-0	94.50	22-0-0	59.40	334-5-0	936.54	0-2-10	6.10	391-7-10	1,096.54
Subtotal.....			94.50		59.40		2,157.47		33.79		2,345.16

See footnote at end of table.



Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harvey J. Winter:											
Italy.....	Lira.....	35,200	56.77	33,100	53.38	7,300	11.77	9,400	15.16	85,000	137.08
France.....	New franc.....	465	93.00	445	89.00	5,472.95	1,107.80	55	11.00	6,437.95	1,300.80
Subtotal.....			149.77		142.38		1,118.57		26.16		1,437.88
D. B. Hardeman:											
Netherlands.....	Guilder.....					4,818	1,340.82			4,818	1,340.82
Poland.....	Zloty.....	760	31.67	1,043	43.46			639	26.62	2,442	101.75
Yugoslavia.....	Dinar.....	60,425	90.57	33,820	45.09	39,405	52.54	16,350	21.80	150,000	200.00
Subtotal.....			112.24		88.55		1,393.36		48.42		1,642.57
Hon. Henry S. Reuss:											
France.....	New franc.....	350	70.00	215	43.00					565	113.00
Switzerland.....	Franc.....	195.50	48.88	85	21.25					280.50	70.13
Belgium.....	do.....					88	22.00			88	22.00
Subtotal.....			118.88		64.25		22.00				205.13
Harold A. Levin:											
Belgium.....	Franc.....	280	5.20	125	2.50	23	.46	100	2.00	508	10.16
England.....	Pound.....	10-10-9	29.49	3-7-9	9.47	0-10-0	1.40	0-7-6	1.04	15-16-0	44.20
West Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	170.55	42.64	54.45	13.61	4,168.75	1,044.80			4,393.75	1,101.05
Subtotal.....			77.33		25.58		1,046.66		5.84		1,155.41
Thomas H. Boggs, Jr.:											
France.....	New franc.....	313.6	64.00	362.6	74.00	65	13.27	58.8	12.00	800	163.27
Italy.....	Lira.....	25,900	41.11	32,130	51.00	5,040	8.00	6,930	11.00	70,000	111.11
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....					4,921	1,224.00			4,921	1,224.00
Subtotal.....			105.11		125.00		1,245.27		23.00		1,498.38
Philip Patman:											
Belgium and Luxembourg.....	Franc.....	3,040	60.80	4,120	82.40	2,661	53.20	420	8.40	10,241	204.80
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	285	71.25	360	90.00	5,810.66	1,381.20	100	25.00	6,556.66	1,567.45
Austria.....	Schilling.....	1,560	60.00	1,325	50.95	105	4.00	310	11.95	3,300	126.90
Greece.....	Drachma.....	1,755	58.50	1,680	56.00	155	5.15	410	13.70	4,000	133.35
Italy.....	Lira.....	24,800	39.35	30,250	48.00	3,850	6.15	6,100	9.65	65,000	103.15
France.....	New franc.....	641	130.80	535	106.20	204	41.65	60	12.20	1,440	293.85
Subtotal.....			420.70		436.55		1,491.35		80.90		2,429.50
W. Andrew Carothers, Jr.:											
Belgium.....	Franc.....	3,950	79.00	4,400	88.00	900	18.00	355	7.10	9,605	192.10
France.....	New franc.....	724	147.75	552	112.65	348	71.02	196	40.00	1,820	371.42
West Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	364	91.00	408	102.00	6,126.66	1,437.20	125	31.25	7,023.66	1,661.45
Greece.....	Drachma.....	1,755	58.50	1,595	53.17	650	21.66	500	16.67	4,500	150.00
Italy.....	Lira.....	25,000	39.66	32,000	50.78	5,800	9.20	7,200	11.48	70,000	111.11
Turkey.....	do.....	360	40.00	415	46.11	97	10.77	128	14.23	1,000	111.11
Subtotal.....			455.91		452.71		1,567.85		120.73		2,597.20
Robert G. Williams:											
Luxembourg and Belgium.....	Belgian franc.....	4,843	96.80	5,000	100.00	776	15.52			10,619	212.32
West Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	465.39	116.34	500	124.60	6,100.75	1,532.85	74.61	18.65	7,140.75	1,792.44
Austria.....	Schilling.....	1,361.30	51.40	1,639	63.35	300	11.55			3,300	126.30
Greece.....	Drachma.....	1,117	37.25	1,483	49.41			400	13.34	3,000	100.00
Italy.....	Lira.....	27,520	44.70	43,070	69.00	9,470	15.50	95.70	15.50	90,000	144.70
France.....	New franc.....	298.20	81.23	500.20	102.08	6,180	12.44	40	8.16	1,000	203.91
Subtotal.....			427.72		508.44		1,587.86		55.65		2,579.67
Vernon A. Mund:											
Belgium and Luxembourg.....	Belgian franc.....	4,800	96.00	5,900	118.00	1,273	44.52	2,200	44.00	14,757	302.52
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	384	96.00	384	96.00	7,016	1,664.70	382	95.00	8,166	1,951.70
Austria.....	Schilling.....	1,600	61.60	1,600	61.60			1,806	69.50	5,000	193.10
Greece.....	Drachma.....	2,250	75.00	2,050	68.00			1,100	36.00	5,400	178.00
Italy.....	Lira.....	30,000	48.39	35,000	66.45			35,000	56.45	100,000	161.29
France.....	New franc.....	490	100.00	441	90.00			169	34.00	1,100	224.00
Subtotal.....			477.19		490.25		1709.22		334.95		3,011.61

<sup>1</sup> Purchased with Mexican pesos.

<sup>2</sup> Represents cost of luncheon meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee, of which Senator Javits is Chairman, at Pavillon Dauphine in Paris.

<sup>3</sup> Witnesses brought to United States to testify at hearings.

<sup>4</sup> Less unused portion of ticket.

#### RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount

22,325.92

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,  
March 8, 1963.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In conformity with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended under authorization of the Joint Economic Committee for the period January 1-December 31, 1962.

These expenditures were authorized by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee

who held that office during the 87th Congress.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,  
Chairman.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,  
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1053. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1057. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1058. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, A "REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa", submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that Committee.

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing In-

dustry, 1958," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. KEFAUVER, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

#### RESOLUTION

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

#### LIBERALIZATION NEEDED IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVIVORSHIP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress in 1948 wisely provided survivorship benefits for those retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This was an important step forward. Last year Congress liberalized the survivorship formula so as to decrease the reduction in annuitants' retirement in order to provide for survivors. Health benefits have also been extended to eligible survivors.

One of the serious weaknesses of the survivorship program is that when a person retires with a reduced annuity with a survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship provision covers only benefits for the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is indeed cruel, and creates extreme hardship in many cases.

I have received heart-rending letters from all parts of the country pointing out this hardship situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks just two of the many recent letters I have received.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HACKETTSTOWN, N.J.,  
January 28, 1963.

Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I enjoyed reading your comments on retirement legislation in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. We are deeply grateful for the interest you have taken and the bills you have introduced to benefit us.

My former husband, who served as a letter carrier for 39 years, died in 1940. In 1958 I received a monthly pension of \$50, granted to the "forgotten widows." I lost my annuity when I remarried in 1960.

My present husband, a retired letter carrier, who served 33 years, designated his former wife for survivor benefits. He is still receiving a reduced pension even though she predeceased him.

My husband feels that since he is paying for survivor benefits, and since I gave up survivor benefits when I remarried, that he should be able to name me as his beneficiary and thus provide for me in the event of his death. This, I know would give him peace of mind.

I hope this session of Congress will pass a bill to solve this problem. I waited 18 years for the "forgotten widows" bill to pass. Now I don't have that much time left.

Again, may I say we are deeply grateful for your efforts in our behalf. Somehow, I feel that when the sunset of your life rolls around, you will be blessed for your kindness to us.

Very truly yours,

CHARLOTTE A. GEIS.

SPARTANBURG, S.C.,  
January 7, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I was deeply interested in the reproduction of your recent address to the Portland, Ore., chapter of retired civil employees, which appeared in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. It was especially interesting to read what you had to say relative to survivorship provisions.

My husband and I were married 10 years ago, 1953, and I am his second wife, and we were married after his retirement. His first wife was designated as his beneficiary and since her death he has been paying on his first wife, as beneficiary, since his retirement on February 1, 1950, and will have to continue to pay under the present law.

I am sure that there are similar cases such as mine and it would be most helpful to thousands of retirees if this injustice could be corrected. We appreciate all that you have done, and are doing for retirees. We are also grateful to you for the assistance given in the last raise of 5 percent; however, it would have been more helpful toward the high cost of living had your more liberal bill been passed.

Wishing you much success in all of your undertakings in the 88th Congress,

Very truly yours,

NANNA P. HARRISON.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today proposed legislation to alleviate this hardship situation. My bill provides that an annuitant retired on a reduced annuity with a survivor annuity may, in the event of death or divorce of his spouse and remarriage continuing for at least 2 years, designate the second wife or husband to receive survivor annuity benefits. I realized that more liberal bills have been introduced previously, and while they have merit they have failed of enactment. I am aware that my bill is more restrictive, but because of the reduced cost involved I am hopeful that it will stand a good chance of favorable consideration.

Other governmental retirement laws such as social security and railroad retirement do provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions imposed by the civil service retirement system. It is my hope that Congress will give favorable consideration to liberalizing the survivorship provisions along the lines which exist in social security and railroad retirement.



Under present law when an annuitant retires and provides survivorship benefits by taking a reduced annuity, the reduced annuity remains in force even though the spouse precedes in death and no benefits are derived from survivorship reduction.

As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I feel that present civil service survivor provisions are unduly restrictive and primarily cause grievous injury to widows, who are oftentimes left destitute in old age. I ask Congress to extend simple justice to our retired Federal employees by liberalizing the survivorship provisions.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended with respect to survivor annuities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1058) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### DESIGNATION OF THE KANSAS HISTORICAL PARK AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the formation and development of the Midwest and West of the United States produced many shining examples of bravery and heroism. Kansas, the center of the United States, played a most important part in this development.

Its brilliant history resplendent in courage, stamina, and character helped to make it a great State—and this a great Nation. Many of the great historical events in the development of our country took place within the boundaries of Kansas. I sincerely believe some of the events and the sites upon which they happened should be memorialized and preserved for future generations.

One of these is Old Fort Hays, Kans.

Established in 1867, Fort Hays played an important role in the opening of the West to settlement and to the building of the Kansas Pacific Railroad across the Plains country. It was one of the last important outposts established for protection of railroad workers and settlers from the Indians who inhabited the Plains.

Many of the famous military men who had fought in the Civil War were stationed here: General Philip Sheridan; General Forsyth; General Armstrong Custer; the famous 7th Cavalry unit and many famous officers of lesser rank. The fort was active for 22 years and in 1889 was abandoned because, it was said, the West had become civilized and there was no longer danger from foes within the Nation.

Two buildings, the famous Block House and the Guard House, both constructed in 1867 of native sandstone, are still in perfect state of preservation and attract tourist attention continuously.

The Block House was the headquarters building when the fort was active.

Two highways intersect at the corner of the reservation, U.S. 40 and 183, and there is a constant flow of visitors to the reservation. The story of the fort is known across the Nation and it attracts general attention. In 3 months' time last summer when the Old Fort Hays Museum, in the Block House, was open, more than 19,000 visitors registered. They were from both coasts and many foreign countries. These buildings are now a part of the Kansas Frontier Historical Park. I believe it should be made a national center of interest to all people. Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate referral, a bill which would designate the Kansas Historical Park as a national historic site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1059) to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### COMMISSION TO PARTICIPATE IN 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

I am offering a bill today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated \$105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to \$150,000 for Federal participation.

My senior colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, is cosponsoring this bill, and Congressman GEORGE A. GOODLING, of Pennsylvania, is introducing an identical measure in the House.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary

of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the Vice President the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] to be a delegate to the Mexican parliamentary meeting, in place of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]; and also the appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] in place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the same meeting.

Also, on behalf of the Vice President, and pursuant to the provisions of section I of Public Law 87-883, the Chair announces the appointment as members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, the following Senators: LAUSCHE and YOUNG, of Ohio, KEATING, of New York, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it had been the belief of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and me that I was a cosponsor of Senate bill 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws, and Senate bill 288, prohibiting strikes at missile sites, but making provision for compulsory arbitration.

An examination of the RECORD shows we were both mistaken in that belief.

Having obtained the consent of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to become a cosponsor of both bills, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bills as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We are very happy to have his support of these measures. I think they are important. I think they are measures which this Congress should act on. I do not think we can continue indifferently and permit some conditions that exist now in the labor-management field. I think both of these measures are necessary for the Congress to meet its responsibilities in meeting the problems involved. I thank the Senator for his support and great concern in this field.

#### ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN FISH-ERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as cosponsors to my bill S. 627, which will

assist States in their fishery research development programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "U.S. and Burma Reach Accord in Working Road to Mandalay," appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 8, 1963; also, an adaptation by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, of Kipling's poem, "On the Road to Mandalay."

#### PROBLEMS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March issue of *Armed Forces Management* appears an excellent editorial on the current problems which confront the Secretary of Defense and the manner in which he has gone about dealing with them.

No job in this Government—other than the Presidency—is more complex or more taxing than that of Secretary of Defense. Secretary McNamara has been exceptional in discharging its responsibilities. As is to be expected of anyone in public office, he is subjected from time to time to criticism. But as Secretary of Defense he has to look at defense from every angle, and at the total cost of defense in juxtaposition with the total problem of defense. He cannot afford the luxury of putting on blinders and not considering all aspects of defense and all elements in its cost. And let me say that we, as a Nation, cannot afford that luxury, either.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I was struck by this editorial. It provides some understanding of the immense scope of the Secretary's current organizational tasks, and a well-balanced evaluation of the way in which he is trying—with great dedication—to discharge them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THIS HORRENDOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllable mouthful called the "trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority" in the Pentagon.

While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.

Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "the trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.

Part of the complainer's difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere be-

low the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.

On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics Basketball Coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They [the team] must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."

It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.

Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.

Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "Gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.

Not that the Secretary's office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."

But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite a while. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)

However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.

If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastized for not doing just 3 years ago.

Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.

For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:

1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason,

said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."

2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time, and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.

Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

C. W. BORKLUND.

#### ADMINISTRATION POLICY OF CONCEALING INFORMATION FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this administration is adopting a policy of concealing from the American people far too much information which has no bearing on our security. It is becoming a habit to conceal waste of the taxpayers' money, under the stamp of a confidential or secret classification.

Today, I call the attention of the Senate to a typical example of unnecessary secrecy. Under date of February 15, 1963, the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report in which the first paragraph reads as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on the review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States under the mutual weapons development program.

The report then proceeds to describe an expenditure of several million dollars, which should have been wholly unnecessary had the Department been exercising the proper degree of caution in the administration of previous programs.

All of this information, however, is marked "confidential." Under this formula the information is for the use of the committee members only, and is not to be repeated to the American people.

I should emphasize that my criticism here today is not directed against the Comptroller General, since it is my understanding that he does not have the jurisdiction of releasing information which is classified as confidential by the



Department of Defense or the State Department.

The final paragraph of this report, however, is "unclassified," and it reads as follows:

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,  
Comptroller General of the United States.

These two paragraphs—the first and the last paragraph of the report—are the only ones which are not classified.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Department for being ashamed of these unnecessary expenditures, but I disagree completely with their right to keep the information from the American people.

#### THE COAST GUARD SHOULD NOT BE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PRIVATE GUARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a new policy of the Kennedy administration under which the Attorney General of the United States has commandeered the U.S. Coast Guard to act as his special nursemaid when sailing his sloop on the Chesapeake Bay. He is demanding this special attention even to the extent of having the Coast Guard ignore calls from other boats in distress.

The U.S. Coast Guard has over the years established an enviable record in protecting the lives and safeguarding the property of those in distress. It has always been the rule of the Coast Guard that people in distress would be helped, without regard to their social or political position.

With this historical background of service, it is with regret that I find that in the present administration there are those who have taken it upon themselves to order the Coast Guard to give special protection to them and their friends, even to the point of ignoring a distress call from others.

This new policy was forcibly called to my attention when a constituent who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay last October 14 had his motor stall, and appealed to the Coast Guard for assistance. Utilizing his two-way radio, this man called the Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station, and asked for assistance.

His message was intercepted by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat which was cruising in the area. The Coast Guard cutter soon arrived alongside the boat in distress, and the one in charge discussed its problem, but stated that he was unable to render any assistance, due to the fact that he was under special orders to trail the yacht or sailing sloop of the Attorney General of the United States around the bay, just in case his boat developed some trouble. He left after telling the man in the broken down boat that he would try to send someone else to help.

The result was that the man and his party were left with a stalled motor, to await assistance from some other source, which hours later came from a private company which towed them to port.

Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has confirmed that

the reason for this was that orders had been received the week before, from the Attorney General's office, instructing that the Coast Guard make arrangements to provide communication with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during the 13th and 14th with the Attorney General of the United States on board.

Based on this request, CG-40572, from Tilghman Island Light Station, was assigned the special mission of surveillance of the *Honya*, the Attorney General's sailing yacht, on October 14. It was while the Coast Guard cutter was carrying out this special assignment that a boat in distress was ignored and was left to wait and hope for assistance from some other source.

It is true that the weather was calm and clear at the time; so, in the absence of any sudden squall, the boat was in no danger; but this is all the more reason why the Attorney General did not need an escort.

Neither the Attorney General of the United States nor any other member of the President's Cabinet nor any Member of Congress has any right to order that the services of the Coast Guard be devoted to his exclusive protection.

It was highly improper for the Attorney General, even though he is a brother of the President of the United States, to allow the Coast Guard to disregard a boat which was in distress, just to trail him around as a special nursemaid.

This administration has said much about businessmen who charge off on their expense accounts the cost of operation of their yachts. But in my opinion it is even worse for an official of the U.S. Government to charge to the American taxpayers the expense of having a Coast Guard cutter operate exclusively just to trail his own yacht around the Chesapeake Bay.

It has always been the responsibility of the Coast Guard to patrol these waters and to stand ready to assist anyone in distress; and over the years they have established an enviable record in that connection.

I am not criticizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard; I appreciate the position in which he found himself when he received such orders from the brother of the President of the United States. But I sincerely hope that in the future he will instruct the Attorney General—who should know the law—that he is not entitled to any consideration different from that accorded any other boating party cruising in the area.

We all recognize that the President of the United States and the immediate members of his family do, and very properly should, have special protection. No one takes exception to that point, but I doubt that even he would ask the Coast Guard to ignore a boat in trouble.

Not only do I very much regret that this incident happened, from the standpoint of the unnecessary inconvenience to my constituent, but this incident is even more regrettable from the standpoint of the embarrassing position in which it placed the Coast Guard.

I sincerely hope that in the future the Attorney General will be more discreet.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, confirming these special arrangements, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of October 22, 1962, concerning the failure of the Coast Guard to assist Mr. —, of Wilmington, Del., when he requested them to do so.

I have received a full report of this matter from the commander, 5th Coast Guard District. This report discloses that the Attorney General's Office requested the Coast Guard to make arrangements in case of emergency to provide communications with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during October 13 and 14, 1962, with the Attorney General of the United States on board. Based on this request, the CG-40572 from Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station (rescue) was assigned the mission of surveillance of the *Honya* to provide communications as necessary on October 14.

At about 1445 hours the *Helen R* is reported to have called for Coast Guard assistance on 2182 kilocycles. This signal was not received by the Tilghman Island station. However, it was heard by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat *Black Jack III*, which immediately relayed the call to the Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station was unable to contact the *Helen R* directly, therefore the *Black Jack III* acted as a relay station and forwarded the necessary information to Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station then notified the CG-40572 on 2702 kilocycles that the *Helen R* was anchored off Wade Point with engine trouble. The CG-40572, which was en route to the *Honya*, at this time, proceeded to the *Helen R* to investigate.

At 1455 hours the CG-40572 arrived alongside the *Helen R* which was safely anchored and in no immediate danger. The weather at the time was clear with light airs and a calm sea. The coxswain of the CG-40572, because of his assigned surveillance duties, called the Baltimore group commander and advised him of the circumstances and conditions. The group commander, when advised of the situation, called the Tidewater Fisheries Service and inquired if that organization could provide assistance to the *Helen R*. The group commander was advised that the Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat at St. Michaels, Tilghman Island, could provide the necessary assistance and would get underway immediately.

In view of the fact that the *Helen R* was in no danger and that the Tidewater Fisheries vessel would take her in tow, the CG-40572 was ordered to proceed on its assigned mission. This information was given by radio to the CG-40572 and the coxswain of the boat advised Mr. — that a Tidewater Fisheries vessel had been called to tow them in. The Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat got underway at approximately 1520 hours and arrived alongside the *Helen R* at about 1600 hours. It towed the *Helen R* into Claiborne Harbor, arriving there at approximately 1630 hours.

From the investigative report, it does not appear that the safety of the *Helen R* was jeopardized by waiting for the Tidewater Fisheries boat. However, it does appear that a clear understanding of the actions of the crew of the CG-40572 and the Coast Guard in calling for assistance for the *Helen R* was not fully made known to Mr. —.

Sincerely yours,  
E. J. ROLAND,  
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,  
Commandant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I called the attention of the Senate to an incident that happened last October in which the Attorney General of the United States had ordered the Coast Guard to follow him around and act as a nursemaid for his yacht during a little sailing cruise in the Chesapeake Bay. Since I made my statement the Attorney General has issued a statement, which I should like to read:

In a statement, Kennedy's office said the Attorney General "took the normal precautions that any boatowner would do and advised the Coast Guard of his proposed course." The statement said Kennedy's "only request of the Coast Guard was 'that they be able to locate him in the event of an emergency.'" It said the Attorney General had no knowledge of any boat in trouble and found it strange that WILLIAMS would put out 5 months later "this distorted version of the incident."

First I answer the Attorney General as to why it took me 5 months to develop the facts. The answer is very simple—I do not have the entire FBI at my disposal where I can order them out in the middle of the night to interview prospective witnesses.

I understand that in his reply the Attorney General also pointed out the fact that the incident occurred in a period in which there was a grave crisis with Cuba. Presumably this was an argument to support his ordering the Coast Guard to stand by.

I wish to keep the record straight for the Attorney General, whose memory apparently slipped. The report which I put in the RECORD was confirmed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard himself, who said that during the week before the Attorney General took his October 13 and 14 cruise, which was on a Saturday and Sunday, his office had been called and asked to stand by for surveillance of the yacht of the Attorney General, which would be cruising in the bay on those dates.

I understand that the Attorney General now claims that one of the reasons he had his office call was that he was inexperienced in sailing. I recognize the danger of sailing when one is inexperienced, but that fact would not give the Attorney General the right to take over the Coast Guard and ask them to trail him around. On that same day the Coast Guard had to bypass a vessel that was in trouble.

As to the Attorney General's reference to a crisis at that time in Cuba, I am glad to know that he has belatedly recognized the crisis, but he certainly must not have known anything about it on this particular occasion because this trip took place on the 13th and 14th of October. He called the Commandant of the Coast Guard and set up the arrangements a day or two before, but based upon the statement of the President of the United States as made to the country on October 22, the President himself did not receive any information about the real problem in Cuba until October 16, which was Tuesday morning. So unless the Attorney General of the United States knew more about the fact that Russia had offensive weapons in Cuba

than did the President of the United States or his Secretary of Defense he certainly cannot use that as any excuse.

On October 22, the President said:

Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

That is a quotation from the President's speech to the country on October 22. The Tuesday to which he referred was October 16.

Furthermore, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his press conference on Tuesday, October 23, said:

The first evidence, the first hard evidence was received by me at 10 p.m. a week ago last night and was presented to the President at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. This was the first hard evidence giving any indication, and that was but partial of the movement of offensive weapons into Cuba.

Here we find the Secretary of Defense saying he knew nothing about the build-up in Cuba with offensive weapons until 10 p.m., Monday evening, which was October 15. The President was advised, based upon both statements, the following Tuesday morning at 9 a.m.

But we now find the Attorney General, who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay on the Saturday and Sunday before, using this crisis as an excuse for having the Coast Guard stand by. Either the administration was kidding somebody then, or he is kidding them now.

I flatly refuse to accept any such excuse.

I wish to make the record very clear that I still think this was an arrogant usurpation of power by the Attorney General. By what line of reasoning does he think that when he takes a cruise on the Chesapeake Bay he has the authority to order a Coast Guard cutter in service to trail him around just in case he might have trouble when at the same time other boats which may be in trouble would be bypassed.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the letter written by the man who was left drifting around the Bay on that particular day. The letter states:

DEAR SIR: I recently had an experience that I believe will be of interest to all boatowners. Five of us went out fishing in Eastern Bay, a branch of the Chesapeake, on Sunday afternoon, October 14. Due to an oversight, the marina that installed a new engine last spring failed to place a resistor in line with the coil. The overburdened article finally burned out when we were approximately one-half mile offshore from Claiborne Harbor. We tried to signal some passing yachts without success, so I finally called the Coast Guard at Tilghmans Island. To my surprise a boat, *Black Jack III*, answered my call saying I could not get through to the Coast Guard but that they would relay my message. This was very unusual. I had never heard of a situation in which the Coast Guard Station could not be reached by radio using the emergency frequency, unless some disaster had rendered their communications system inoperable. However, even more unusual things were to follow.

We gave our description, location, number of passengers and nature of our trouble to *Black Jack III*, who called back in a few minutes to inform us the Coast Guard boat

would be along shortly. After 20 minutes had elapsed, we sighted the Coast Guard 40 footer across Eastern Bay and signalled to him. When he came along side, the skipper informed us that he could not help us then because he had to watch the "Secretary General" who was taking a sail. He hung around for a few minutes about 50 feet away and we could hear him across the water talking with someone on the radio describing our boat.

Without any further word, he left and followed a sloop of about 30 feet that was taking a leisurely sail back and forth across Eastern Bay. We watched until both boats were completely out of sight beyond Poplar Island.

Two and one-half hours later, a Maryland Tidewater Fisheries boat came by and asked if we were broken down. They very courteously gave us a tow into Claiborne harbor which took between 5 and 10 minutes. There we found a mechanic who quickly installed a new coil and we were finally on our way again. The skipper of the fisheries boat informed us that Bobby Kennedy was taking a sail that afternoon in Eastern Bay.

There are some implications in this incident that bother me a great deal. Perhaps my background is partially to blame for my concern. I was born and raised on the North Carolina coast. There the life saving service had its origin and subsequently was expanded into the U.S. Coast Guard. The men in that service were the heroes in our section. They were the ones who willingly risked their lives to give assistance to boats in distress. They never refused, regardless of the conditions. They were always on call.

Now I wonder what has been done to that wonderful organization? Has it become a political football to be used as a private babysitter for political appointees? Of one thing we can be sure. Someone ordered that Coast Guard boat to follow Bobby Kennedy. They did not close down a whole Coast Guard station on their own initiative. Who issued such an order and from where came the authority to do so? What would have happened if a real emergency had occurred and the skipper tried in vain to reach a Coast Guard station that was not monitoring the emergency channel?

As I mentioned previously, I am bothered and I believe a number of the boating fraternity will be also.

Sincerely,

Mr. President, certainly the Attorney General did not know the week before that he was going to break down on the following Sunday. If he did, he should have stayed in the harbor. Furthermore, he cannot say that he was out in the bay at a time when there was fear of a Cuban crisis. If there was he should have been in Washington attending to his business.

In addition, I should like to know how he knew so much about what would happen in Cuba the following week, when the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any knowledge until the following week as to what was happening.

I still think that what occurred was an arrogant action on the part of the Attorney General. I hope he will be more discreet in the future.

#### HIGHER INTEREST RATES NO SOLUTION TO BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, one of the difficulties of the proposed tax cut is bound to be an adverse effect on our international balance of payments,



which is already adverse. That is true because the increase in spending at home is sure to increase imports. At the same time testimony before the Joint Economic Committee by economic experts is that a tax cut would also be likely to increase costs and prices, which would decrease our exports. The administration has proposed that one way to counteract this tendency would be to increase interest rates in order to encourage investment of capital in our country. Such a procedure has many weaknesses and difficulties.

I was very much impressed by the fact that the Wall Street Journal, which has been consistently in favor of high interest rates, published this morning an article by the able and accomplished commentator George Shea on that very issue. Mr. Shea points out that the great difficulties involved in trying to improve our balance-of-payment situation by increasing interest rates. He suggests that such action aimed primarily at short-term interest rates would be sure to increase long-term interest rates and tend to slow down the economy. That position was corroborated by economic experts brought before the committee, some of whom said that if we persisted in the monetary policy suggested by Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, the multiplier effect of the tax cut would be sharply reduced, and that whatever stimulating effect a tax cut might have on the economy would be very greatly diminished.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful and authoritative article by Mr. George Shea on the front page of the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The Kennedy administration seems to be leaning toward higher interest rates on borrowed money as a means of combating the deficit in the Nation's international payments. However, causing or permitting interest rates to rise entails some difficult problems.

The theory is that higher interest rates would help reduce our deficit because they would cause investors, businesses, banks—foreign as well as domestic—to lend their cash here instead of abroad where interest rates now are higher than they are in this country. The sending of such money abroad has been a substantial factor in the size of the deficit in the last few years. Also, the administration has noted that England and more recently Canada have found their international deficits shrinking rapidly when they raised interest rates at home substantially.

However, one problem that faces the money managers if they decide to raise the cost of borrowed money is that they would like to concentrate the boost in rates on short-term funds. It is this kind of money that moves most quickly across international borders in search of the most attractive interest rates. Long-term money likes high interest rates, too, but it is also influenced by other important considerations.

In addition, high rates on, and restricted supplies of, long-term credit are supposed to be bad for general business, whereas the rates on short-term loans are not so important. Businessmen, it is widely believed,

hesitate to commit themselves to pay high interest rates for years ahead to build a new plant or apartment house, or to buy new equipment, but they don't mind so much in the case of a loan that will be repaid in a few months.

The questions are whether it is possible to change rates on one kind of money only and how it can be done. The answers are, first, that it isn't entirely possible, but that short-term rates can be changed much more quickly and widely than long-term rates; and second that the only measure that works at all well is a change in the supply of credit—which sooner or later affects long as well as short rates.

Long rates almost always move with short rates because lenders or borrowers can switch from one to another. If short-term rates soar to 6 percent while long-term rates stay at 4 percent, lenders will stop offering money at long term, tending to cause the rates on long-term money to rise, and will offer their money at short term, tending to cause those rates to fall.

The fact that short-term rates fluctuate more sharply than long-term rates is clear from the record of recent years. The following table gives average rates by years through 1962 and so far this year on U.S. Treasury 3-month bills and U.S. long-term bonds:

	[In percent]	
	Bills	Bonds
1963.....	2.9	3.9
1962.....	2.8	4.0
1961.....	2.4	3.9
1960.....	2.9	4.0
1959.....	3.4	4.1
1958.....	1.8	3.4
1957.....	3.3	3.5
1956.....	2.3	3.1
1955.....	1.8	2.9
1954.....	1.0	2.7

In that period of more than 9 years the short-term rate has fluctuated between 1 percent and 3.4 percent, or 2.4 points, whereas the rates on long-term bonds have an extreme range only between 2.7 and 4.1 percent, or 1.4 points. Put another way, the differential between the long and short rates has been as wide as 1.7 in 1954 and as narrow as 0.2 in 1957.

The causes of these fluctuations in the differential provide a good answer to how such changes can be engineered. Since late in 1960 the Federal Reserve Board and the U.S. Treasury have been seeking jointly to keep short-term rates strong for the same balance-of-payments reason that now concerns them. They've tried to do it by keeping the supply of Treasury bills available in the market especially large by selling such bills whenever they could. But at the same time the "Fed" has kept the Nation's banks supplied with substantial unlent reserves.

The measure of their success has been that the differential has narrowed from 1.8 late in 1960—when bills paid 2.2 percent and bonds 4 percent—to 1.2 now. In contrast, note what happened in 1954-57 or 1955-57, when there was no particular effort to stiffen short-term rather than long-term rates, but when the supply of unused bank credit was gradually restricted as business boomed. The differential then narrowed from 1.7 in 1954 and 1.1 in 1955 to 0.2 in 1957.

Another means of raising short-term rates, being mentioned aside from restrictions on bank credit, is boosting the Federal Reserve discount rate. That's the interest banks pay when they borrow from the Reserve banks. By itself that probably wouldn't work well either. The discount rate is effective when banks are borrowing heavily in order to make loans, and at such times they want to earn more than the discount rate of any loans or securities they hold. At present the bill of 2.9 percent is below the 3-percent discount

rate, because the banks aren't borrowing much. Just raising the discount rate now would be acting almost in a vacuum.

Thus one problem the Government faces is that the only way it can engineer the boost in short-term rates is to restrict credit generally, and it hesitates to do it at present because of a fear it might hurt business. That's why Secretary of the Treasury Dillon the other day brought forward as a new argument for a tax cut that it would strengthen business enough to stand higher interest rates, which he said were needed to reduce the international deficit.

There is another problem, too. A lot of the short-term funds that have gone abroad in search of higher interest rates have gone to England, as well as to other European nations. The difference is that while the nations of the Continent seem pretty well able to stand a reversal of the flow of funds back to the United States, England is regarded as vulnerable, its balance of payments being precarious like ours. After this newspaper had reported on the new interest-rate plan of the administration last week, the British pound weakened in the foreign exchange market.

GEORGE SHEA.

#### MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS RESOLUTION FOR MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I have introduced proposed legislation to support the appeal of Secretary of the Interior Udall for a commission which would consider proposed statuary to commemorate distinguished statesmen. A number of newspapers around the country have supported my proposal. I am happy to see that some newspapers in our own State of Wisconsin are included among those.

One of the recent editorials on that subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial pointed out that among those who have been honored by statuary in the District of Columbia are Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jussarant, Sam Gross, and the original patentees of the District of Columbia.

The fact is that whenever a proposal to honor almost anyone is made by a Senator or Representative in behalf of a friend or a person he supports, it is difficult and embarrassing for a Member of Congress to oppose the proposal. That is why I think the commission suggested by Secretary Udall makes sense, not only from the standpoint of the District of Columbia, but also particularly from the standpoint of the American taxpayer, because it could discourage wasteful expenditure of funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 6, 1963]

#### CLUTTER OF STATUARY

"Unless we exercise some discrimination in honoring our great departed statesmen, Washington will become a clutter of stony statuary." Senator PROXMIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in criticizing the continuing practice of his congressional colleagues in approving monuments.

PROXMIER is backing up Interior Secretary Udall, who wants a curb on new monuments

and a commission to make sure that any that are approved are deserving.

Ever hear of Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross or "The Original Patenteers of the District of Columbia"?

The Interior Department, according to the Washington Post, reports that these individuals are among those honored by some 96 statues or memorials in District of Columbia park land. They stand as evidence that memorials often don't stir memories after a generation or so. And they argue for being extremely selective in deciding upon future memorials to give pigeons a roosting place.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 17, 1963, there was a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans in New York City under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of New York commemorating the 45th anniversary of restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Mr. President, this dedicated group, all citizens and permanent residents of the United States, are seeking independence and freedom from the tyranny and evil of Soviet colonialism for those who remain in Lithuania. They seek the liberation of those with whom they have ancestral and close family ties.

This was a sad occasion for this group. As free people themselves, they know that the chains of communism cannot bind the hopes of men nor hold back the desire of people, who were once self-governing, again to attain the sacred goal of independence and freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian rally of February 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 17 of this year of grace 1963 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State;

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation by Soviet colonial rule;

Acclaiming the firmness and determination of the President of the United States during the Cuban confrontation and his unequivocal attitude toward the evil of Soviet colonialism, as expressed in the state of the Union message last January;

Acknowledging with gratitude the stand taken by the U.S. delegation in the United Nations on self-determination for Lithuania and the other captive European countries;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania and to all other captive European nations of a free exercise of their right to self-determination and the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Resolved:

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in the United Nations and elsewhere the established U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom

of Lithuania through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1963, as Captive Nations Week;

3. To urge that the Radio Free Europe extend in its broadcasts the use of the Lithuanian language;

4. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combating communism, Soviet imperialism and colonialism;

5. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and its freedom;

6. To support actively the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government of their own choice.

J. KIAUNE,  
President.  
A. SKERYIS,  
Secretary.

#### THE 245TH NIKE MISSILE BATTALION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the reorganization of the Army National Guard, one unit that has been designated for elimination in New York State is the 245th Nike Missile Battalion. This unit has a particularly long and fine tradition of service to the Nation, dating all the way back to 1654.

Naturally, changing defense needs call for continued reevaluation and planning but in my judgment, it is most unfortunate when a unit with such a historic background is told it can no longer play its honored role in national defense.

I am asking the Department of Defense for a full report on this matter, but in the meantime I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a brief history of the regiment.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THIS IS YOUR REGIMENT

In 1654, a company of "Minute Men" was organized by the Dutch burghers in Breucklen (Brooklyn), to suppress lawlessness and smuggling in their village and nearby communities along Long Island Sound.

To that early body of Dutch "Minute Men", the present 245th Nike Missile Battalion traces its proud lineage, and can well boast as being one of the oldest continually active units in U.S. Military Establishment.

When, in 1776, the 64th Regiment of Foot was organized as a part of the Continental Army, this same Brooklyn unit of "Minute Men" was given the signal honor of becoming the "Right Flank Company" of that regiment and fought as such throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Old family records and authorized histories establish a continuity of service of individuals through this "Right Flank Company" of the 64th Regiment of Foot to the "Old Village Guard" which, later, when the village of Brooklyn became an incorporated township, consolidated with the Nassau Guards to form the "Brooklyn City Guard."

In 1847, the New York State militia was composed wholly of independent companies without any battalion or regimental organization. This heterogeneous composition finally attracted the attention of the State legislature with the result that a new division of 12 distinct regiments was authorized for Brooklyn alone.

One of the leading companies in point of numbers and efficiency, at this period, was the aforementioned "Brooklyn City Guard." Through the efforts of this company, 8 other independent companies joined with them in forming a regiment which was embodied into State service on July 5, 1847, as the first of the 12 newly authorized regiments and designated as the 13th Regiment of Infantry.

To conform to the regulations of this period, the assignment of the companies was as follows:

Right flank company of light artillery, Brooklyn City Guard; Company A, Pearson's Light Guard; Company B, Washington Horse Guard; Company C, Brooklyn Light Guard; Company D, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company E, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company F, Oregon Guard; Company G, Washington Guard Rifles; Company H, Jefferson Guards.

The two companies of Williamsburg Light Artillery shortly after withdrew and two other companies were admitted; City Cadets as Company D; Greenwood Rifles as Company E.

In the present organization of the 245th Nike Missile Battalion, Battery A is the direct lineal descendant element of the old right flank company of that original 13th Regiment of Infantry.

The first time this 13th Regiment of Infantry was called for active Federal duty was for Civil War service when it was the first New York militia regiment to volunteer to a man for service and was in the field for three known periods from April 23 to August 6, 1861, May 28 to September 12, 1862, and June 20 to July 20, 1863. It has been confirmed that the records covering the regiment's further periods of service in the Civil War were lost in the unfortunate fire which destroyed the old armory on Hanson Place in Brooklyn.

The regiment's next tour of Federal service was in the Spanish-American War when it was mustered in on May 24, 1898, as part of the 22d New York Volunteers with which it served until it was mustered out on November 23 of the same year.

The regiment remained as the 13th Infantry until 1900, when it was organized as artillery and designated the 13th Heavy Artillery and companies then became batteries. This designation was changed on September 1, 1906, to the 13th Coast Artillery. On June 23, 1908, they were changed to the 13th Artillery District and on August 10, 1914, to the 13th Coast Defense Command. During the disintegration of the regiment at the time of World War I, this number and title were temporarily discontinued, but were revived on the reorganization of the National Guard in 1919.

In World War I, the regiment entered the Federal service on July 23, 1917, and was assigned to Forts Wadsworth, Hamilton, and Tilden, in the New York Harbor defenses. The command was shortly after broken up, the greater part forming the nucleus of the newly organized 59th and 70th Coast Artillery regiments, and officers and men were also assigned to the 38th, 46th, 50th, and 74th Coast Artillery, 119th Field Artillery, Trench Mortar battalions, ammunition trains, motor transport and the 6th Antiaircraft Light Artillery. A great majority of these organizations served with distinction and efficiency in combat action in France, particularly in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives and the defensive sector of the 1st Army, the Lorraine sector. After the departure of the regiment for World War I action, the



13th Coast Artillery Corps, New York Guard, was formed for emergency State service as infantry and was disbanded when the National Guard was reorganized at the war's end, the return of the war personnel who again resumed normal peacetime service as the 13th Coast Defense Command, which designation continued until January 1, 1924, when the regiment was given the number and title, 245th Coast Artillery.

Under the Presidential proclamation of national emergency in 1940, the 245th Coast Artillery was once again called to Federal service and sent to garrison the artillery fortifications at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, most of the senior noncoms and officers of the regiment were sent to various training camps over the country as cadres to train the rapidly expanding Army that was to eventually carry the United States to victory over the Axis Powers. The remainder of the regiment was brought to full combat strength and served throughout World War II. Members of the 245th saw action in all parts of the globe during the monstrous conflict; in all theaters of the war, from Bataan to Okinawa. Some older veteran officers and noncoms of the regiment became the nucleus for the 18th Regiment of Infantry, New York Guard, formed for State duty in 1941 and deactivated in 1945 with the reorganization of the 245th at the end of World War II.

Once more the "call to arms" was sounded, this time in 1951 when the Communist forces of North Korea attacked South Korea, and a United Nations force was alerted, and the 245th was again called to service until the cessation of hostilities in 1955.

Over the years, the regiment has been called for State service in aid of civil authorities as follows: New York draft riots, 1863, when it was rushed from Gettysburg, immediately following that battle to help quell the bloody riots in New York City; the orange riots of 1871; railroad riots in 1877; Buffalo railroad strike in 1892; Fire Island, 1892; Brooklyn trolley strike, 1895; guard for public property, 1917.

At the present time, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion is serving the Nation at missile bases on Long Island, proud of the fact that from the early company of Dutch "Minute Men" to the present battalion of "Missile Men," this staunch and venerable organization of American fighting men has ever been ready to serve its country's call, and will, in the words of the late Gen. Sydney Grant, one of its beloved commanding officers, always "Carry On."

#### AFRICAN STUDENTS LEAVE BULGARIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a constituent of mine—a young man from Rochester—has written to me about a commendable project which has been undertaken by the students at Brown University. Recently, 12 students from Ghana and 6 from Ethiopia fled from Communist Bulgaria, where they were attending a university as exchange students. They charged racial bias on the part of the Communists and asserted that they had encountered forced political indoctrination, police brutality, arrest and constant insults behind the Iron Curtain.

Upon reading of this incident, students at Brown decided that the situation presented them with a golden opportunity to demonstrate America's good will and interest in the education of African students. A petition was circulated requesting the administration of the university to offer a scholarship to one of

these African boys. Within hours, 200 Brown and Pembroke undergraduates signed the petition and over the weekend, the university administration acceded to their request. The university has pledged to match any funds which are raised by the students themselves, and to offer admission to one of the Africans who is qualified. The students, have raised a substantial share and hope that the full amount will be raised in time for the exchange student to come to this country in September.

I call this incident to the attention of the Members of the Senate, because I feel it is a fine example both of American initiative and the good will of our youth toward the many visiting students we welcome to our shores each year. It is exactly this kind of spirit which gives me assurance that the recipient of this scholarship will be far happier in the United States than he was in Communist Bulgaria.

#### GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me today to pay tribute to the Girl Scouts of America during this the week of their 51st birthday.

We all welcome the sight every spring of those familiar figures in brown and green in groups of two's and three's, laden with boxes of cookies, beginning their annual sale. The event serves to underline the fact that the organization which developed out of the Girl Guides of England is another year older.

It was on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., that Juliette Gordon Low founded the first troop of Girl Scouts in this country with 12 members. Since that time the Girl Scouts have captured the imagination of millions and become an American institution.

In those early days of the Scouting movement, the Girl Scouts waived tradition and moved into the realm of outdoor activities such as camping and active sports previously reserved for their male counterparts. One of their prime aims has always been to develop the whole worth and dignity of the individual, not merely one segment of it.

Today the Scouting program for girls from 8-18, Brownies to Senior Scouts, is carried on in 51 nations of the world. Its interesting and worthwhile projects, its ideal of service to community and country have directly affected the lives of over 18 million girls in the United States alone, and have had an indirect influence on countless others.

I feel that I should say something, too, about the indebtedness of the organization to the millions of men and women who have volunteered their time and energies as leaders and administrators to help make the Scouting program a success.

The Scouting program has helped to guide girls into the path of maturity by offering them a solid basis upon which to build for the future. The Girl Scout laws set forth an ethical code by which to live and develop into responsible citizens of a free democracy, willing to assume the task of making our country a better place in which to live.

To quote the Girl Scout Council of the Nation's Capital:

Girl Scouting is more than fun. It opens windows to knowledge, doors to skills, and provides opportunities for friendship and service across the Nation and around the world. Girl Scouting is learning by doing and living by the best ideals of democracy.

#### ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, perhaps never in our national history has medical care been of such universal concern as in this year of 1963. Fortunate are those areas where the people enjoy abundant hospital facilities and a dedicated medical profession.

Such an area is my State of Rhode Island and particularly its capital city of Providence.

This year—this very week—is the centennial of one of the great centers of medical concern and service to both the city and the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

One hundred years ago this week the General Assembly of Rhode Island passed the act to incorporate the hospital and on March 13, 1863, the then Governor of Rhode Island put his signature to the document.

As the Rhode Island history of that month of March 1863 is intertwined with the history of this Senate, it seems appropriate to present the record here in a single paragraph.

There had been a quick change of command in Rhode Island. The man who was Governor on March 13, 1863, had been merely a State senator 2 weeks earlier. He had succeeded to the presidency of the State senate and then to the Governorship only because both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island in March 1863 were in this U.S. Senate recently removed to this Chamber. On March 4, 1863, Gov. William Sprague succeeded Lt. Gov. Samuel Greene Arnold who had been U.S. Senator from December 1, 1862. Samuel Greene Arnold was the granduncle of our beloved former colleague, Theodore Francis Green, who was born only 4 years after Rhode Island Hospital was founded.

March 1863 was indeed an historic period. In the words of a speaker at the dedication of Rhode Island Hospital—

the Civil War was at the height of its grim and desolating fury. It was a time when, if ever, men are inspired with generous sentiments and are ready to acknowledge the high humanities and duties that bind them to each other and to their race.

But an institution for the healing of the sick and the care of the injured must be an expression of something more than Christian benevolence alone. It must also be the embodiment of every device and arrangement which science has discovered or art has contrived for the alleviation of suffering and the restoration of health. Philanthropy prompts the enterprise but it is science that presides over its accomplishment and fits it for its high ends. Civilization must lavish upon it its choicest treasures both of humanity and knowledge, in making it all that it ought to be.

For all this century Rhode Island Hospital has taken the spirit of that oration

as an obligation. Out of the generosity of individuals and with the cooperation of the official community there has been built upon the gift of land and buildings—extended land and expanding buildings—one of the largest voluntary hospitals in all our land.

It has assumed what might have been immediate burdens of city and State and in an annual cost of \$10 million has given more than a million dollars in free services to the community.

Last year 20,000 of its neighbors were admitted for bed care and over 40,000 more received emergency treatment. Seven hundred thousand bed patients have known Rhode Island Hospital's care.

Its medical and surgical staff have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science—it has been a center of teaching and research; and Brown University has honored its staff in the projection of their new medical studies. In every respect the hospital has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern progressive medical school.

The original incorporators were all physicians but its practical encouragement came from all segments of our people and that close affinity has prevailed through this century of substantial co-operation.

We of Rhode Island are proud that the hospital bears the name of our State, but is as independent as the independent man who stands atop our state house. Our Governor and our general assembly by proclamation renew this week their enthusiasm of March 1863.

Every man, woman, and child, of every race and faith, salutes Rhode Island Hospital for its century of superlative service.

#### TRIBUTE TO A DEPARTED MOTHER

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the loss of a loved one is an experience that everyone of us must have. While it is a loss and grief that our friends share with us, no one can ever really know the true meaning of the loss to the individual.

We cannot capture the inner emotions of the individual and we keenly feel our own inadequacy to express our sympathy.

That distinguished writer and commentator, Tris Coffin, has written a tribute to the mother of a mutual friend of ours. It is a moving tribute that comes the nearest to capturing the inner emotions of one's sorrow that I have ever read or heard.

Because I think it has a very deep and meaningful message for most everyone, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TRIBUTE BY TRIS COFFIN

I have a friend who drives 15 miles to work every morning and then the same 15 miles home again. In the morning, the drive isn't bad, for this is a new day. He sees the frost glistening on the ground if it is winter, or if the time is spring he has been walking in the dew, or if summer picking wild strawberries. This gives a tang to the day, and he leaves the country in good spirits. This

pulls him through even the terrible traffic snarl at the point where all the suburban roads dump into one overcrowded city street, to the tune of impatient horns.

The evening is different. My friend works hard and in a very competitive society, the Congress. He is conscientious to an extreme, has a great generalship for plotting and conducting the sieges and countersieges. And what is also rare, he is intelligent and daring. This means that by the end of the day, 6 o'clock or even as late as 9, much of his emotional energy has been spent, he is weary beyond account, and still intent on the wars of the day.

An associate who rides with him tells me my friend, Bill, may drive all through the horrible rush-hour traffic of the city saying nothing but an occasional terse, ironic phrase, and grim faced.

There is a point, an exact point, when he changes, throws off the mask of the office. This is when the city is left behind—its noise, its confusion, its overbright signs, its deceptions, and he can see open spaces. Perhaps they are overgrown with weeds and the owner is waiting to sell for a good price, but it is country.

My friend Bill begins to relax. His fingers on the wheel loosen. The hard lines of his face fall away and he smiles.

His mind has sped ahead to the moment when the car will pull in the driveway of the house with the white fence around it, and he will get out, and look up at the window. A face will smile at him, perhaps waving a hand or nodding, depending on how she feels this night. This face is beautiful, it seems to me, and indeed it is, for it shows always, steadfastly a joy in life. No matter what has happened, her face is proud of living.

She is my friend's mother, and she has been an invalid for a number of years, sitting in the chair at the window, watching the bluebirds, the squirrels scampering across the snow, the wind tossing the upper branches of the trees, the pattern of the clouds, the gathering gray of dusk. She had been an active, talented woman, a lawyer and a beauty. Sickness altered her life, as much as if she had been picked up by a storm and sent spinning off to Timbuktu. More, because she had to accept quietness, reflection, the knowledge that death may fall with the next shadow.

To hear him tell of her, with great admiration, the new life has not shrunk but enlarged, nobled, and given an almost cosmic dimension. She discovered joys lost to most of us, joys dearer than all those we pursue so madly. My friend was able to share some of these joys with her, and this is why when the city was gone and only the stretch of country left, he smiled in secret enjoyment.

He might wonder what it was she had seen today to make her life more exciting, sitting there by the window. Would it be that the bluejays came again, big and brilliant and comic, or a rabbit crossing the yard had paused to look up at her and stare, his nose twitching? He looked forward eagerly to hearing from her. The end of the day always had this promise for him.

But no joy is ever eternal. Bill and his mother understood this, she better than he. This is what he tries to remember now when, driving in the evening, he leaves the rumble of the city. He knows that when he enters the driveway and looks at the window, there will be no smile for him. She has left him, as she knew she would. Still she is there in all the things she loved outside her window.

This is the essence, perhaps, of death and transfiguration. No one ever dies completely, but remains in the rose tumbling over the arbor, the evening star, the first call of the song sparrow.

#### EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, many Americans have been shocked by

the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to cut back or eliminate the junior ROTC program. In my judgment, this is one of the finest youth programs in our country. Under the program, young men are taught discipline and love of country. I believe the program has instilled in our youth a desire to participate in the national defense program.

I have seen many young men who were in the junior ROTC programs go on to college, further their ROTC education, become some of the finest officers in the military organization of our country, and serve for long periods of time in the defense of the Nation. Probably the desire to perform this service was inculcated during their participation in the junior ROTC program.

It is strange indeed that we would be considering programs for a domestic Peace Corps and for a youth program and at the same time the Secretary of Defense would be discussing eliminating or abolishing the ROTC program, which I believe costs the magnificent sum of approximately \$5,500,000. I am informed through articles in the press that the Secretary of Defense is considering or is reappraising this program. I hope he will reach the conclusion that the program not be abolished.

Mr. President, the General Assembly of Georgia has adopted a resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 68

Resolution opposing the proposed cutback and urging the expansion of junior ROTC; and for other purposes

(By Senator Hunt of the 26th)

Whereas the Defense Department has recommended a proposal to eliminate the Reserve officer training program in our high schools and to streamline the college ROTC program; and

Whereas military service is still compulsory in the United States; and

Whereas money now being spent on compulsory training could be diverted into an expanded junior ROTC program to sustain summer training; and

Whereas the money would be reasonable pay to the young men involved which could eliminate financial hardships; and

Whereas summer military training would reduce the summer influx on the labor market and reduce juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas in many cases the present system is harmful to many of our young men because they postpone making decisions on their future education, training, or professions because of their service obligation; and

Whereas under a new and expanded program the military could select volunteer military personnel who excel in ROTC; and

Whereas through a system of promotions and further inducements the military would produce high-type personnel who were trained during the years when they learned best and excelled most; and

Whereas the rigors of an intensive and thorough military training program would give our young men an outlet for their energies which would be used to a productive and healthful advantage; and

Whereas under this program training would be continuous until completed rather than interrupted as at present (or no training at all) until the youth enlists or is drafted under the current compulsory military training program; and



Whereas the best soldiers are generally between the ages of 18 and 25 when given the proper training and leadership; and

Whereas if we discontinue high school ROTC this will mean raising our average training age several years which will be a decided deterioration of our military potential: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia,* That we go on record as opposing any cutback in the present junior ROTC program and further go on record as recommending a proper and adequate expansion of junior ROTC; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit a suitable copy of this resolution to each Member of the Georgia delegation of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

Approved in senate March 5, 1963.

Approved in house March 6, 1963.

### IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a speech prepared by Mr. Ed Webster, a senior at Cody High School, Cody, Wyo. Eddie is an outstanding young American who is presently the president of the Cody High School student body and an active member of his church. He is truly a student of Americanism as indicated by his keen insight into the things that have made this country the envy of the world. He has prepared a speech entitled "In God Is Our Trust," which points out the anguish suffered by the God-loving people of America when the Supreme Court recently ruled that the 22-word nondenominational New York school prayer was unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

We are citizens of the greatest Nation in the world today. A nation which offers untold opportunities for man to better himself. A nation who proclaims to the world:

"Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;  
Send these, the homeless, and tempest-tost to me,  
I lift my lamp beside the Golden door."

This Nation was founded by the people seeking an opportunity to worship God, how, when, and where they would. This factor was so important to these founders of yesterday that they inscribed into almost every national document an assurance that this loyalty to, and fraternization of God, would continue as long as these United States should endure.

The worship of God as one deems fit, and the guarantee that all others have the same right is insured in our Bill of Rights; on every coinage of this country is the statement, "In God we trust"; the Declaration of Independence is believed by many to have been inspired of God; in the national anthem is reference to our trust in God.

Belief and worship of God has been a factor of strength and hope throughout our Nation's history. This belief was so strong as to induce thousands to leave their homes and come to this promised land when it was hard, cruel, treacherous, and unknown. The army of George Washington, as it fought for our independence, is reported to have

had a minister in the lines; and throughout the years the soldiers of the United States have had a chaplain with them to give them spiritual guidance and comfort.

From the very beginning of the First Continental Congress, a prayer has been said at the beginning of every day's session of the Supreme Court, and of Congress. As late as 1954, the line "under God" was inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag, again proving the devotion of the American people to Almighty God.

It might be well to remember that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, his first move toward world conquest was the expulsion of religion from the schools. Slowly and methodically he succeeded in doing away with religion in the schools, the government, and lives of the German people. It would seem that this example, and others of godless nations who rose to great power and then toppled, would serve as sufficient warning to the wise; however, today we find ourselves facing an alarming situation: Dateline 1962: The Supreme Court of the United States ruled it unconstitutional for a 22-word prayer to be said at the beginning of every schoolday in New York schools. This prayer read:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This prayer was repeated at the beginning of each schoolday along with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Those who did not wish to participate, could remain silent or be excused from the room; or even come late to miss the prayer. There was no possible way that anybody could take offense at a prayer which was set up in this way; yet, because one family took a dislike to this prayer, it was ruled unconstitutional.

Justice Stewart, who gave the one vote for the constitutionality of the prayer, remarked: "Is the Court suggesting that the Constitution permits judges and Congressmen and Presidents to join in prayer, but prohibits schoolchildren from doing so?"

Nearly half the States require or authorize either prayers or Bible reading in their schools, however, steps are now being taken by the American Civil Liberties Union, who sponsored the New York case, to bring these cases into question, along with the legality of a Christmas program in the schools, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and baccalaureate services.

Presently there is question being raised as to the constitutionality of saying a prayer at the beginning of each day of Congress. action is also being taken against the last verse of the national anthem which states: "And this be our motto; in God is our trust."

But this is not the end, if these measures are allowed to be ruled unconstitutional, there will be an ever-ending flow of cases concerning the coinage, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and every Bible reading, or religious holiday observances in the 35,000 schools which now participate in such practices.

Now, I ask you, Will this great Nation, founded under a strong faith in God, now deny that same faith—that same God? Will this great Nation, who has prospered above all other nations, forsake the very creed on which its prosperity has flourished? A strong and unwavering faith in the Almighty has grown to be one of the predominating factors in America's greatness. What were our forefathers looking for when they stepped ashore on the desolate, windswept shores of America of yesteryear? A place where they could worship their God in peace, without censor or magistrates. Freedom of worship—foremost among all the freedoms we hold so dear.

Tyrants and dictators throughout the ages have denied the existence of the Almighty—

have tried to replace His hallowed presence with the false image of greatness they have built around themselves. Allegiance to a cause, rather than to God, and they have failed miserably.

Will our beloved America follow in the footsteps of these godless tyrants?

The voices of millions of Americans, raised in unison, thunder a defiant "No." And as silently, these millions bow their heads together, and in the faith that makes them great whisper in humility, "In God we trust."

### JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I request that the memorial be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 19

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to export its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the house of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring),* That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved February 13, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,

Governor.

CHARLES G. IRWIN,

President of the Senate.

MARLIN T. KURTZ,

Speaker of the House.

# NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS—STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Gen. Lauris Norstad made a brilliant and able statement before the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations this morning. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, FORMER SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE; MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP., AND PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL DIVISION; CHAIRMAN, ATLANTIC COUNCIL, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS, SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

I am honored to appear as the opening witness in your study of national security staffing and operations.

Until now my experience has been entirely in the armed services, and what I have to say this morning will be based on that experience. I have had the good fortune to participate in some interesting enterprises. When I was in the War Department shortly after the last war, I worked with one of the most distinguished military leaders of our time, the late Adm. Forrest Sherman, on a number of studies which helped to clear away some of the final obstacles to the reorganization of the Nation's Military Establishment in 1947. These studies included worldwide military command arrangements, roles and missions of the three services and finally the details of the agreement between the War and Navy Departments which was the basis or starting point of the Unification Act itself.

But an unusually large part of my experience has been overseas—with American and Allied commands. Since I first put on a uniform 37 years ago, more than half of my service has been abroad—which may be a record of some sort—and perhaps living and working far from our shores has given me a certain kind of perspective as it has many others who have shared this experience—a perspective which is not necessarily better but one which comes from a slightly different angle.

An outstanding characteristic of the years since the Second World War has been the steadiness of purpose and action of the United States in building strength in the free world. The Soviets have pursued their ambitions with determination. But they have encountered a will at least as firm as their own. The confrontation we call the cold war has, right from the start, involved a test of wills. On the outcome of this test depends in good degree the future of the freedom we hold dear.

For many years we were preoccupied with the weakness of Western Europe. For years to come we will be adjusting to the fact of its strength. In great part, the problems ahead—and there are and will be great problems—arise from the success of our policies. But I would far rather live with such problems than to be wrestling with the difficulties that would have grown out of continued European weakness.

Sometimes people talk as though success were a state of affairs in which there were no problems. But as I see it a successful country, like a successful man, will never see the day that does not bring a fresh quota of problems, and the mark of success is to deal with them effectively.

We learned some important lessons from World War II, and we have shown a capacity to go on learning. That is the important thing. I have no qualms about the future so

long as we can examine the past coolly in order to improve our performance in the future.

Along with other democracies, we learned at great cost in the thirties that a foreign policy is no more impressive than the force that exists to back it up. It took us a long time to learn this elementary principle of international affairs. Back in 1911 Admiral Mahan said to a congressional committee:

It appears to me that the three functions of Government—the diplomatic, the Army, and the Navy—work now in what you might call watertight compartments. \* \* \* It seems there is very little appreciation in the country of the relation between diplomacy and Army and Navy. \* \* \* Our military and naval policy depends substantially upon what we conceive our relation to be with foreign countries, a forecast of the future, and what the probabilities of the future are. \* \* \* I think what is very much needed in this country is to bring the three functions into necessary relation with one another.

In 1947, when Congress passed the National Security Act, creating the Department of Defense and the National Security Council, we took a substantial step in the direction indicated by Admiral Mahan in 1911.

The President has always had full authority over the armed services, and still does. No President, however, can give the management of military affairs the time the job requires. He needs a deputy who can. If we did not have a Secretary of Defense with authority, a President could, in times like the present, spend all of his energy dealing with military issues—and still not get the job done.

It is sometimes said, I know, that the 1947 act did not unify the armed services but instead further divided them. The charge does not stand up. The National Security Act with its amendments has created a strong Department of Defense and has given strength and authority to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We can, we should, we do criticize when criticism is warranted but it seems to me that the structure of the Military Establishment permits us to have strong military services, balanced internally and in relation to one another, and all under the supervision, direction, and control provided for by law. If we sometimes have difficulties, what would be the situation, today, with all its complexities, if we had not taken the road to unification in 1947? It is hard to imagine, frightening to contemplate.

I have served in unified commands—and although I know that you of this committee appreciate the significance of this development, I do not believe that there is a full understanding in the country of the degree to which the services are now organized and operated according to the tasks to be performed and not according to the color of a man's uniform. Unified commands were, of course, established in World War II but the progress in this field, in the last 10 or 15 years, although it has been so quiet that many people have not noticed it, has in fact been quite dramatic.

The creation of the Department of Defense, the 1947 Reorganization Act and all that has flowed from it, have not only improved our military posture but have made it far easier to relate defense to national policy as a whole.

The creation of the National Security Council was another part of our national effort to learn and apply the lessons of the Second World War. Congress charged the Council with the task of advising the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

It is obvious that we have not always achieved a successful integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies. And I think

this committee is doing a most interesting and important work in studying our policy processes with a view to improving them. There is most certainly room for improvement, and some will consider this a notable understatement. But we should also keep in mind that the National Security Act of 1947 has served us well. On the whole our Military Establishment has effectively served our foreign policies and has meshed effectively with allied forces. The contrast with earlier periods—the approach to World War II for instance—is striking.

But you are interested in possible improvements. And here I would like to draw mainly on my NATO experience. Looking at the policy process in Washington from overseas, I have drawn a few conclusions that may be of interest to the committee in its work.

1. In thinking about problems of administration, too much attention tends to be paid to system and perhaps to little to men and their relationships. System is obviously important. But policy is not the product of a system. It is the product of responsible men who are in touch with one another.

A crisis highlights this fact, for it engages the attention of the highest authority and by stripping away the nonessential from the essential relationships, it identifies the men who are in fact his advisers and helpers, whatever the organization charts may say. Authority attracts authority. Responsible men attract responsible men around them. I have never known it to fail that when the going gets rough, responsible authorities are drawn to each other.

This is just as true and as necessary in allied relationships as in national. When one has command responsibilities, he feels a need to be in personal touch with key allied leaders. In a crisis, authority comes to have a very personal meaning, and one must go to the sources of authority before taking action. Things have to be done that way. A commander has got to know, of course, where the top political authorities stand, but more than this he must have a "feel" for their attitudes, a sense of their moods. A direct contact, therefore, is most useful.

At a time like the Cuban crisis last October the President, it seems to me, acts virtually as a commander, personally assuming direction of detailed operations on which depend peace and war. He is in frequent and intimate touch with his assistants in Washington and the field. And decisions are made as they go along.

Involving the highest authority in this degree of detail is, I suppose, a new departure. Certainly the President's title as "Commander in Chief" evokes a picture of larger and grander units than those with which he sometimes has to concern himself at the early stage of a serious development. We in the military service may sometimes feel that this is "getting into our business." But in my judgment the power and the speed we deal with today makes it necessary. At time of crisis, when the issue is peace or war, there is no substitute for direct, person-to-person relationships between the highest political and military authorities, and this inevitably involves the Commander in Chief, the President, in considerable detail.

A key factor is the quality of the relationships between the men who carry responsibility. No one can write directives fast enough to meet a crisis situation, like a Berlin or a Cuba. The man in the field may have to make decisions—and it is essential that he be in direct contact with the political authorities. In terms of my own experience, the NATO machinery works but it can and should be improved in this respect. I have tried to suggest some ways in which this could be done. But the machinery is less important than the personal relationships that have been built up over the past 14 years among leaders in the allied countries.



I speak emphatically—and freely—on this subject because my own experience in this respect has been a most satisfactory one. My own work as Supreme Allied Commander Europe was made possible by the understanding and support of the leaders of the 14 countries with whom we are allied in NATO, and, when necessary, by direct contact with the President of the United States in the two administrations under which I have served.

2. The second point I wish to raise is really a question of definition. To say that any issue or policy—economic, military, cultural, or whatever—which bears directly on our relations with other countries is essentially political, will startle no one who has thought about the subject. Our military forces, for instance, serve political ends. The limits or constraints within which we act are political in nature—as recent events in Europe eloquently demonstrate. The most powerful military force is helpless without the will to use it and the political ability to control and direct it.

One of our real problems in formulating policy at any level is that too many people become involved in it, with too many preconceived ideas, producing too many little policies.

Policy—and here I speak of what we might call grand policy—must be established at the top. That is the only way clarity as to our objectives can be achieved—and without such clarity day-to-day decisions on this or that particular issue will lack focus and coherence. Moreover, the higher policy is made the less likely it is to be a pale concoction of warmed-over ideas. One of the things I have learned over the years is that the higher one's responsibilities, the less one can afford the luxury of preconceived ideas.

Grand policy, or national policy, can be coordinated in a committee, a board, or a council but it cannot be developed there. Someone has to think through the problems and propose what our policy should be—for consideration and decision at the highest level. In the foreign field, for example, Defense and other agencies make contributions, and proposals can and should be examined and debated in groups or committees. But the particular responsibility belongs to the Secretary of State and his associates. If this conclusion, because it is so obvious, falls short of being a notable one, perhaps we should ask ourselves whether our practice faithfully reflects it.

One sentence in the committee's staff report struck home with great force. It is that "the nature of concrete policy issues and the character of governmental action processes push for a pragmatic one-thing-at-a-time-on-its-own-terms approach" to policymaking. And of course this is true. When a specific issue arises, we so often shop around for a solution to the problem in its own terms rather than in terms of our larger purposes.

Good staff work is supposed to insure the careful and broad look at a problem—and we should gratefully take advantage of whatever help it can provide. Clarity at the top is probably a precondition to good staff work, for if your staff does not know what you are trying to accomplish, how can the staff advise you about the consequences of this or that particular decision?

But given a clear understanding of objectives, then a staff of knowledgeable persons, tuned to the political realities, who have developed over the years the ability to sense the full implications of a situation, can be extremely helpful.

3. Another conclusion I have reached is that we Americans talk too much, especially when we are abroad. Paris was a good place to observe this phenomenon, for almost everyone came to Paris, sooner or later, and almost everyone had something to say.

It seemed to me that we sometimes spoke with too many voices. On a number of occasions important European officials asked me how seriously to take what appeared to be a statement of a new American position on a subject of interest to NATO, made by someone just off the plane from Washington. I could always say quite honestly that the American position remained as it had been stated to NATO bodies by the appropriate American representatives. Nevertheless, such episodes can lead to serious misunderstandings.

I think we should strictly follow the established procedures for making known the American position on policy questions.

In my experience, our officials who travel about the world saying that American policy is this or that rarely say it in exactly the same way. It comes out differently each time, and this is quite understandable.

It is a rather pleasant American habit, in some ways, to do our thinking out loud, but it is not a way to conduct affairs with other governments.

My own rule at SHAPE was to report facts but not to try to make news. In the first place, SHAPE was not supposed to be a policymaking organization, and I did not want it to be thought of as an important source of news. My public relations officers sometimes got a little impatient with me about this, but I am sure that had we talked more, it would have made it more difficult for us to do the jobs we were sent there to do.

We were able to speak with great frankness to allied governments, and when necessary to express sharp disappointment at their policies. We could do this because they knew the discussions were confidential and would not be spread all over the morning papers or even reported to other official agencies which had no need or right to such information. I think that we often accomplished a good deal because they were grateful that delicate matters were not aired too freely.

4. A closely related point is that reappraisals of our policies should be made as quietly as possible. Of course, we must review our policies from time to time. A new administration, for instance, certainly has an obligation to do so. I have always thought that it is useful to throw the policy papers away every so often, and reexamine things from the ground up. Unless one does this, the tendency is to work on producing a better mousetrap instead of asking whether a mousetrap is the best way to catch the mouse.

But it should be done privately. For as soon as one begins an analysis, reappraisal, or reassessment, one attacks, or at least brings into question, the validity of one's plans, policies, or strategy. And, furthermore, it may be that once the basic concepts are opened up for reassessment, one will find that some people want to go in one direction and others in exactly the opposite direction. This is especially true in dealings with allies. Some may want to reduce their commitments at the very time we think that their commitments ought to be increased. In that case reappraisals may become agonizing indeed.

I am afraid that we tend to involve too many people in such reassessments. There are too many Indians writing too many papers. The fewer the people, the better their product is likely to be. I once created a planning staff at SHAPE and assigned five colonels to it. It was a planning group that was all chiefs and no Indians. The idea was to get fewer papers but a better product. Believe me, it worked.

5. The last point I want to raise is that we should make a deliberate effort to develop our most promising talent.

A good man is still hard to find. When we find one with judgment and courage,

with intellect and intuitiveness, we should do everything we can to bring him along fast, to put him in situations where he can develop—especially situations where he is called upon to carry responsibilities at least as heavy as he can carry, even a little heavier.

I remember that back in the thirties a lieutenant I knew received a promotion to captain. He had been a lieutenant for almost 20 years. I congratulated him, but did not get a warm response and asked him why he wasn't happier about his promotion. I will never forget his reply. He said: "Norstad, don't you know that a man who has been a lieutenant for 20 years will always be a lieutenant?"

When we find a good man, therefore, we ought to push him ahead rapidly, even if this means some preferential treatment. For men grow when they have to make decisions and carry responsibility.

I might also add that we should make every effort to build up and give support to our officials, civilian and military, who serve in allied groups. I am not talking about press-agent techniques, but about the marks of confidence and support that say much more about personal trust and reliance.

We want our officials in allied groups to have influence and to be effective advocates of our interests. There is no better way to help them than to show that they have influence in our own counsels and have the respect and confidence of the men for whom they work.

Finally, the tasks of national security, I believe, may well be more complex and demanding today than ever before. Foreseeing as early as 1946 our basic dilemma, Henry Stimson said these wise words:

"The sinfulness and weakness of man are evident to anyone who lives in the active world. But men are also good and great, kind and wise. Honor begets honor; trust begets trust; faith begets faith; and hope is the mainspring of life. I have lived with the reality of war, and I have praised soldiers; but the hope of honorable, faithful peace is a greater thing, and I have lived with that, too. That a man must live with both together is inherent in the nature of our present stormy stage of human progress, but it has also many times been the nature of progress in the past, and it is not reason for despair."

The choices before us are profoundly difficult and they lie within firmly fixed limits: we must devise the means that will discourage and prevent war with its terrible destructiveness, but we cannot weaken the guarantees of freedom, we cannot forfeit the means of defending the future of our Nation and of the individual liberty without which we could not live.

#### THE TASK OF IMPROVEMENT OF U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 7, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon addressed the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association on the subject "Our Unfinished Task of Improving the U.S. Balance of Payments."

This address is a very fine exposition of the relationship between the President's tax program and the balance-of-payments problem, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate especially in this respect.

I ask unanimous consent that the address and an editorial commenting on it, published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**OUR UNFINISHED TASK OF IMPROVING THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS**

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association, Princeton, N.J., Thursday, March 7, 1963)

A year ago, in Rome, I reviewed with you our balance-of-payments problem and the measures we were taking to deal with it. Today, I would like to appraise the record of the past 12 months in the perspective of the hard tasks still before us, and discuss the contributions which can be made to equilibrium in our international accounts by the President's tax proposals.

While last year's progress toward our goal of overall balance was disappointing, we continued to move ahead, and the groundwork for further improvement was laid. I am convinced that tax reduction, prudently financed and accompanied by persistent and firm expenditure control, can play a major role in that improvement. It will also free the hands of American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise—thus reinforcing our already strong defenses against pressures on the dollar during the difficult period until balance is fully restored.

Last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit amounted to \$2.2 billion—the smallest annual deficit since 1957, and only a little more than half the total 2 years ago. But, measured against the \$2.4 billion deficit of 1961, progress was limited, and the gold outflow continued at close to \$900 million.

However, it must be remembered that during 1962 we absorbed the full impact of the rebound of imports from the abnormally low, recession-induced levels of 1961. As business recovered at home, imports increased by \$1.7 billion, or 12 percent. Exports also rose substantially during the first part of the year, but then tapered off, reflecting the slower growth of our export markets in Europe and Japan. The Canadian tariff surcharges, together with adjustments in the Canadian exchange rate also, had a measurable adverse effect on exports during the latter part of the year since Canada is our single, largest foreign market. As a result, our commercial trade surplus (which excludes aid-financed shipments) declined by about \$1.2 billion from the exceptionally favorable 1961 figure. While this surplus, at \$2 billion, was still larger than that of any other Nation, its decline last year offset almost all of the improvement in our other accounts.

A major source of improvement during 1962 reflected our persistent efforts to curtail the outflow of dollars stemming from our commitments for defense and aid. Taken together, the net balance-of-payments drain from these two programs was reduced by more than \$700 million. Much of this improvement stemmed from implementation of the cooperative logistics agreements with West Germany, providing for increased purchases of American military goods and services, while simultaneously strengthening the defense capabilities of both countries.

The vigorous efforts of the Department of Defense to economize in its own foreign exchange outlays were unfortunately offset by rising local costs and the full-year impact of the "Berlin buildup" on the size of our forces based in Europe. Moreover, the usual long interval between foreign aid commitments and actual spending obscured the progress that has been made in supplying a larger share of American assistance to the developing countries in the form of American goods and services.

However, on the basis of current policies and directives, there is a clear prospect of

further savings in these two areas in the years ahead. For example, more than three quarters of AID commitments during this fiscal year will be directly reflected in purchases in this country, and that percentage is being raised still higher. A new agreement with Italy provides for the purchase of American-produced military equipment in an amount in excess of the foreign exchange costs of maintaining our forces in that country during 1963. And the Defense Department is continuing to reduce its foreign exchange outlays.

Smaller outflows of short-term capital also contributed to last year's improvement. However, the outflow was larger than we had expected. Much of it was submerged among unrecorded transactions making it difficult to pinpoint the precise cause and the source of these outflows. Certainly, our effort to maintain a structure of short-term rates in the American market that would reduce the incentive to shift funds abroad in search of higher interest returns—an effort that was greatly facilitated by downward rate adjustments in some important European markets—appeared to be reasonably successful, and the upward trend of trade financing and foreign bank loans tapered off. However, the total of short-term and unrecorded outflows, placed at more than \$1½ billion in preliminary reports, remained uncomfortably high and clearly indicated an area where much further progress is required.

Outflows of longer term private capital, approximating \$2½ billion, continued in undiminished volume, although the composition shifted somewhat as direct investment fell off moderately while the total of new foreign bond issues on the New York market rose. In discussing this problem at Rome last year—when the anomalous pattern of borrowers in Western European countries with strong payments positions seeking large amounts of long-term funds in the United States was already becoming clear—I suggested that much of the difficulty stemmed from the absence in Europe of an efficient, fully effective capital market mechanism, freely open to potential foreign borrowers and capable of absorbing new issues in the required volume. The fact that roughly 45 percent of the total official European, Australian, and New Zealand flotations in New York last year were taken up by foreign buyers—in some instances located in the same country as the borrower—provides further confirmation of this analysis.

It has been gratifying to us that during the past year a number of European countries have begun to reexamine their capital market mechanisms, recognizing their own internal need for more efficient means of mobilizing and distributing savings to support further rapid growth. Italy has made particular progress in developing and strengthening its capital markets and has also found it possible to open them to a few international institutions, as well as to initiate measures to free portfolio investment abroad by its own residents. I have also been glad to see signs of greater interest on the part of American commercial and investment bankers in participating in this process of strengthening European capital markets. That is an area where efforts to provide better service to your customers operating abroad by assisting them to raise local capital and credit can also have important benefits, both for the host country and the United States. Dramatic results cannot be expected within a limited period of time, but over the years ahead, the result will be a healthy freedom from dependence on the New York market, with a consequent lessening of one drain on our balance of payments.

Other factors of basic, long-run strength became more apparent during 1962. For instance, the flow of earnings from our \$60 billion of private foreign investment rose

by almost 10 percent to a new record of more than \$3.5 billion—a figure that will continue mounting in the years ahead. Even more important, for it underlies our whole international trading position, has been the sustained stability in the prices of our industrial goods and materials. Unit wage costs have not risen since 1961, and the index of wholesale prices has now been virtually unchanged for 5 years. In contrast, pronounced upward cost pressures have developed in most industrialized countries in Europe, squeezing profits and bringing price pressures of the sort that have been all too familiar in this country.

A few years ago, there was much talk of a deterioration of the international competitive position of the United States. Today, that talk is diminishing—and for good reason. Our share of world exports of manufactured goods, after declining substantially during the fifties, has been essentially stable since 1959.

At the same time, however, we must recognize—as our alert competitors did long ago—that our competitive position depends on more than price alone. Knowledge of markets and willingness to search them out, product design, sales and servicing facilities, and export credit facilities are all vitally important. Recognizing the key role of commercial exports, the Government is improving and strengthening the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, as well as the export programs of the Department of Commerce. But, in the last analysis, it is the American businessman who must make the sale—and I should add that alert banks can play an important role as catalysts.

Now let us see how our program of tax rate reduction and reform can help to reinforce and support these various developments that are contributing to longer run balance of payments improvement. First of all, it will provide new incentives for investment and intelligent risk taking—increasing profits directly through lower tax rates, and indirectly through enlarged domestic markets and the establishment of a better atmosphere for growth. This is the best way—and ultimately the only way consistent with our free market system—to encourage the productive employment of American capital at home, and to attract more foreign investment to our shores.

It is clear that enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home—and in which increases in interest rates are a reflection of the improved profitability of investment opportunities.

The more rapid growth fostered by tax reduction will, to be sure, generate further increases in our imports. To the extent that this results in higher foreign exchange earnings by the developing countries, we can expect larger demands for our exports as well. But more directly, the tax program can also help to sharpen the competitive position of our industries in world markets. Our export effort must be concentrated on new and sophisticated manufactured goods, for it is there that export markets are strongest, and there that the needed expansion in our foreign sales must be centered—but it is also there that our foreign competitors have made their greatest strides. We must redouble our efforts to remain at the very forefront of technological progress by applying our scientific abilities to industrial products and processes, and incorporating our



new technology in new investment. The President's proposal to permit equipment used in research and development to be charged off as a current expense will directly support this objective. But far more important is the basic encouragement tax rate reductions can give to investment and growth, so that our industry can be better equipped to pour out in ever-increasing volume the new products the world wants.

Thus, there are sound reasons for believing that the tax program will, as it becomes fully effective, reinforce the fundamental longer run factors that are moving our payments position toward equilibrium. But I would not want to lull anyone into a false sense of confidence over the immediate outlook. The sound medicines of more profitable investment at home, stable prices, and a dynamic industry penetrating new export markets can work their cure only with time.

The immediate prospect, as nearly as any one can judge, is for another year of deficit in 1963, and for further gold losses. Faced with this prospect, it is vitally important that we redouble our efforts to reduce further the drains related to our Government programs overseas, and to achieve the kind of performance of our market economy that will bring higher exports and move attractive investment opportunities at home. At the same time, to meet our immediate problems, we need to maintain sound defenses for the dollar. That is why we have worked so steadily, in full cooperation with our friends abroad, to test and develop a wide variety of techniques designed to head off speculative disturbances in the gold and exchange markets and to absorb temporarily excessive supplies of dollars passing into the hands of foreigners.

We fully recognize that these devices are not substitutes for balance-of-payments equilibrium. Indeed, their success ultimately depends upon confidence in our ability and willingness to deal with our fundamental payments problem. But they are an important bulwark for the international payments system upon which all free nations depend, and which ultimately rests upon the free interchange of gold and dollars. Moreover, the usefulness of these arrangements in meeting potential or actual pressures on the dollar and on other currencies has now been amply demonstrated—for example, at the time of the stock market break, the Canadian crisis, and last fall's Cuban showdown.

But, during this critical period, we also need flexible monetary policies, alert to possible strains on the dollar and free to respond promptly in time of need. The difficulty today is that in the absence of expansionary fiscal or tax policy, a sharp and substantial tightening of credit could present real risks to the domestic economy. But, as the President has emphasized on several occasions, and specifically in his tax message, "a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require." In short our immediate balance-of-payments situation offers one of the most telling arguments in favor of a tax policy designed to stimulate the economy and thus give greater freedom to those who bear the heavy responsibility of administering monetary policy.

I do not pretend that the tax program alone can meet all of our problems at home or abroad, or that it entails no risks. That would be nonsense. Fiscal policy is not a tool to be used with abandon. We would much prefer to have been able to present our tax program within the context of a balanced budget, and we had hoped to do so. But we cannot afford to wait—and the prospect of budgetary balance in the years ahead will be enhanced, rather than reduced, by soundly conceived tax reduction. Our unsatisfactory growth of recent years, the sluggishness of our investment, the pres-

ures on profits, our idle capacity and manpower, and the failure of revenues to expand with more vigor, can all be traced in good part to the restraining effects of a tax structure unsuited to today's needs. I am firmly convinced—along with a broad cross section of the business community—that to continue operating with the present tax structure would not be consistent with true fiscal responsibility.

We have arranged the phasing of the proposed tax reductions over 3 fiscal years in a manner, consistent with earlier proposals by business groups, that will minimize the transitional budgetary deficits. In fiscal 1964, the great bulk of the anticipated \$12 billion deficit would face us in any event, and has no connection with the tax program. The critical need is to finance this deficit in a way that will not give rise to renewed inflationary pressures as we move closer to full employment and reasonably full capacity operations. This is what we have done in financing the deficits of the past 2 years—and what we mean to do in the future.

Our latest figures on the distribution of the public debt, those for January 31, show that the entire increase over the preceding 12 months was financed outside the banking system—an increase of \$1.8 billion in Federal Reserve holdings being fully offset by an equivalent decrease in commercial bank holdings. Furthermore, the increase in the outstanding marketable debt maturing in 5 years or more was larger than the total deficit. This policy of working persistently toward a balanced debt structure can be symbolized in a short-hand way by the fact that on March 15, after taking into account the results of our current advance refunding, the average maturity of the marketable debt will be 5 years and 1 month, 11 percent longer than at the end of 1960, and the longest since the fall of 1958.

Some observers have felt that we have been over zealous in our desire to maintain a debt structure that will avoid the danger of excessive liquidity and a future inflationary problem. But this view, in my judgment, underestimates the continued availability of new savings in amounts more than adequate to meet the current borrowing requirements of business, individuals, and State and local governments, as well as the essential need to forestall any rebirth of inflation as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Moreover, the techniques available to us—and especially the device of advance refundings—have enabled us to attract longer term funds with a minimum of market disturbance.

As I look ahead, I see no reason to believe that we cannot continue for some time to finance the deficit largely from savings, without bringing strong upward pressures on market rates, for there is today a vast flow of funds through our financial institutions seeking longer term commitments. Of course, as investment activity increases in response to the stimulus of tax reductions, private credit demands will also expand, and the available supply of savings will be more fully absorbed. As I have suggested, this is one of the primary reasons why the tax program can be helpful to our balance of payments. We must also recognize that under these conditions, interest rates may rise in response to market forces—even though savings, too, can be expected to rise with incomes.

I can assure you that we have no intention of retreating at that point to excessive monetization of debt to meet our financing needs. When the economy approaches more closely the limits of its capacity, we will need to redouble our guard against potential inflationary pressures. Even more to the point, the higher revenues generated by economic expansion would be directed toward achieving budgetary balance and surplus,

thereby releasing savings for productive use by other sectors of the economy.

The President has repeatedly stated that, after enactment of the tax program, a substantial portion of the increased revenues that can be expected in the years ahead will be devoted to reducing and eliminating the budgetary deficit. This policy is an integral and essential part of our financial and tax program. In recognition of the need to accompany tax reduction with rigorous expenditure control, several billions of dollars were cut from estimates developed only a few months ago. Programs that in other circumstances might have been expanded were cut back or deferred. Efforts to achieve economies—including those within the Defense Department—were intensified. And we are proceeding vigorously with efforts to substitute private for public credit wherever feasible.

Nevertheless, a realistic appraisal of the international situation has compelled a further increase in our spending for defense. And our program to put a man on the moon in this decade required an increase of \$1.8 billion in space expenditures. These items, together with interest costs, account for more than 70 percent of our entire budget, and for all of the increase in fiscal 1964. Total spending for civilian programs is scheduled to decline. In a longer perspective, it is worth noting that, of the total increase of \$17.3 billion in administrative budget expenditures over the 3 fiscal years from 1961 to 1964, \$12.6 billion is for defense, space and interest on the public debt, while not much more than a quarter, or \$4.7 billion, is for civilian programs. In the 3 preceding fiscal years—excluding temporary unemployment compensation and all the other anti-recession expenditures incurred by this administration during the closing months of fiscal 1961—the rise in civilian spending was over \$4 billion, or almost as large.

Our Defense Establishment is now approaching the new level of readiness set by the administration, and Secretary McNamara has expressed his confidence that the upward spending trend will taper off after fiscal 1964. If our lunar exploration timetable is to be met, another sizable—but probably smaller—increase in spending for space will be necessary in fiscal 1965, but the prospect here also is for a leveling trend thereafter. This will substantially ease our budgetary task, but we recognize that it will not relieve us from the need for continuous rigorous screening of domestic civilian programs.

A compelling case can be made for increased spending for certain of these civilian programs, some of them new, that are vital to the national interest, but it is our job to find the savings in other areas that will make these programs possible within the confines set by our target of budgetary balance. In undertaking our program of tax reduction we have committed ourselves to do just that. But to defer the tax program to some indefinite future point in the hope that budgetary balance can somehow be achieved with present tax rates—when it is those very rates that stifle the growth we need—seems to me to be self-defeating, and to carry grave risks both for domestic expansion and the balance of payments.

There are simply no easy solutions to our multiple problems at home and abroad. The challenge, for both Government and business, is to appraise these problems realistically, and to seek together in a spirit of partnership the kinds of answers that are fully consistent with our traditions of free markets and free enterprise. The special role of Government, beyond intensive efforts to economize in its own overseas spending, must be to provide an environment of monetary stability, responsible budgetary and debt management policies, and freedom from oppressive taxation in which private enterprise

can find renewed incentives to invest at home and to seek our profitable export markets. The special responsibility of business is to make extra efforts—consistent with its own longrun interest—to develop foreign markets and sources of foreign finance, to exercise appropriate restraint in wage and pricing decisions, and—by no means least—to contribute to a process of serious discussion and debate from which intelligent public policy can emerge. Over the past 10 years these monetary conferences sponsored by the American Bankers Association have provided a forum for just such discussion, and I am especially grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss our thinking with you today.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

#### GROWTH AND PAYMENTS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon's speech at the annual monetary conference of the American Bankers Association in Princeton provides an effective antidote to the unfounded fears that a tax cut and a larger fiscal deficit will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and accelerate the outflow of gold.

The Secretary's cogent analysis provides a timely rebuttal to the argument advanced by a segment of the banking community which holds that there is a direct and inexorable series of causal links between fiscal deficits, increases in the domestic money supply, balance-of-payments deficits and gold losses. According to this view, which has an articulate proponent in John Exter, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, a balance-of-payments equilibrium can only be achieved by restrictive monetary and fiscal policies. But this view flies in the face of both logic and the dreary monetary experience of the 1930's. Far from solving the balance-of-payments problem, restrictive monetary and fiscal policies would at this juncture plunge the economy into a recession and do irreparable damage to confidence in the international dollar.

Mr. Dillon was on firm ground in insisting that the only hope for improving our balance-of-payments position lies in accelerating the growth of the American economy. By expanding the volume of activity and increasing the demand for domestic investment funds, the tax cut will strengthen our international payments position by reversing outflow of capital. And the Secretary added that "it is clear that the enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer-run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home."

Mr. Dillon also said tax reduction will "free the hands of the American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise." This remark has strengthened the speculation that the monetary authorities may act to raise short-term interest rates after the passage of the tax bill. But since high interest rates have hardly been successful in stanching the outflow of short-term capital, other alternatives should be exhausted before measures which arrest domestic activity are adopted.

#### EDUCATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, there came to my attention a notable address delivered to the graduating class of the Connecticut State Police, by Sam-

uel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American Airways, who resides in Greenwich, Conn. There were 34 graduates, 4 being sons of State police officers and the majority being former members of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Pryor's address centered around the point that if we are to save our society from crumbling from within we must give much more attention to the professions of education and law enforcement.

It was an address filled with good sense, from a man who is not only one of the most outstanding businessmen in the country, but one who has also given so generously of his time and energy to civic causes.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR.

I thank your commissioner for inviting me to say a few words on law enforcement to this graduating class. In addition to the privilege he has given me of cooperating with your State police force and the privilege Chief Robbins has given me for many years of cooperating with our Greenwich police force, I have for some years had the honor of being an official adviser to the Bureau of Narcotics of the U.S. Treasury Department. I attended their Advanced Narcotics Training School, and just last year represented the commissioner at the Interpol convention in Copenhagen. This experience has convinced me that Edgar Hoover was right in saying that law preserves the heart of our democracy and freedom; but the existence of law itself is no guarantee that it will be administered effectively. You must play your part in effective administration. How law is administered is the safeguard to democracy and freedom, which each and everyone of us treasure so deeply. I strongly believe that if the moral fiber of our country is to be maintained—if we are to survive in a competitive world—we must have greater citizen cooperation and assistance in support of our law enforcement agencies. Crime is a community problem, not just a police problem.

My business takes me to 81 countries of our world, so possibly I see law enforcement at work in many countries, cities, and towns—in many ways—good and bad—more than the average citizen. It has been my privilege to visit many of the ancient cities, which are now either in ruins or buried under desert sands, not only in the European countries but also in the pre-Christian kingdoms, and on our own continent, the Mayan civilization, the Aztec, and the Inca. Some of these civilizations have been dead now over 2,000 years. Each of these nations, at its peak, stood in the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishment. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time.

Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves. What is happening to us today—right now in this year 1963. Crime in the United States increased five times faster than the Nation's population in the 5 years preceding 1962. Some 7,800 law-enforcement agencies in the country reported an estimated 1,926,090 serious crimes in 1961, 3 percent more than in 1960. On the average there was a murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, major larceny, or automobile theft every 16 seconds in 1961.

Preliminary statistics for 1962 show a continuing upward surge. A 5-percent increase

was recorded in the first 9 months of 1962 over the same period of 1961.

A major increase has occurred in one of the more serious types of crime—bank robberies, burglaries, and larcenies in 1962. There has been an average of 100 such crimes each month for an increase of about 25 percent over 1961.

An analysis of crime statistics reveals that the crime rate—number of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants—generally is higher in the areas with the largest population increase. The crime rate in metropolitan areas—cities over 50,000 and their fringes—is three times greater than in rural areas, and twice that of smaller cities.

Over half the cash and property stolen in robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts in 1961 was recovered through effective law enforcement work. Also, the vast majority of crimes committed directly against individuals were cleared by arrest, ranging from 93 percent of all murders to 73 percent of all forcible rapes.

There is an average of just under two police employees for every 1,000 inhabitants in the United States. This should leave no doubt that greater citizen cooperation and assistance is needed by law enforcement agencies in protecting the safety and welfare of the Nation and its citizens. Every citizen should do what they can to combat crime. A great help would be the taking of simple precautions with property of value. Of the burglaries committed in 1961, 21 percent took place in buildings to which some means of access had been left open. A great reduction in the \$22 billion annual crime bill could be effected if citizens merely took normal, intelligent steps to protect their property.

Crimes reported from agencies within our State of Connecticut for the first 9 months of the 1962 calendar year were up 18 percent from 1961—the increase primarily attributable to the increase in burglary and larceny categories. The percentage of reported crimes cleared by arrest for this same period was approximately 38 percent, which is above the national average.

As each of you goes out from here to join the ranks of law enforcers, you will come to wonder how the citizens of this country can be so unaware as to virtually invite the committing of crime daily. The fact remains that the public is often naive, and this will be a constant irritant to you in the days and years ahead.

Yet you must never lose sight of the need—indeed, the duty—to teach the everyday citizen to help you safeguard his freedom. This aspect—education—can be as important in your new role as that of actual crime detection and prevention.

If you will permit me a bit of pride as a resident of Connecticut, let me emphasize to you the State's program of education, for example, in the area of motor traffic alone. Whereas many States appear to welcome speeders as a potential source of income, laying traps for the unsuspecting (and unwarned) driver, Connecticut does everything it can to educate the driver to exercise prudence before it cracks down. This genuine attempt to help citizens protect themselves is a goal to keep before you always. Law-enforcement agencies reflect the spirit of their communities.

As I mentioned before, I have had an interest in a special area of law enforcement—narcotics. In no other area can education do so much to prevent the thrill-seeker, the depressed, the experimenter from becoming a rotting shell of a human being.

While the Soviet countries have us all looking into space, they are encouraging the distribution of narcotics, not in their countries, but in all other countries around the world including our own. A teenager can become a dangerous criminal by becoming an addict to heroin. Governments can fall or surrender to the Communists easily if



enough government officials, using bad judgment, should come under the influence of narcotics.

Nationwide attention was directed to this problem in the latter part of September, during the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. It was my privilege to be a representative at this Conference. The Conference, which was held on September 27 and 28, brought together 400 experts in the various fields of medicine, the social sciences, and law enforcement.

Two aspects of the Conference are particularly noteworthy. First, the President announced his intention to appoint a special committee to advise him regarding a program for the civil commitment of narcotic addicts and their rehabilitation. Second, it was pointed out that the abusive use of dangerous drugs (i.e., barbiturates and amphetamines) may be a more serious problem than the abusive use of narcotic drugs. The President's advisory committee is to inform him regarding any needed Federal legislation in this area.

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria, Rome—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas—were not destroyed from without. In each and every case the conqueror found a civilization which had begun its self-destruction from within. We can look back through the long, long vista of human history and we can see that today the whole cause of human freedom is in the greatest danger mankind has ever known.

Thinking about this has brought me to the conclusion that there are two professions that we in this country must encourage and strengthen to the utmost—teaching and law enforcement. I do not think we are going to have a nuclear war. Our one enemy capable of waging nuclear war against us realizes that there is no such thing as victory today; if they attacked us, our country would be half dead, but they themselves would be three-fourths dead. Therefore, the war in which we will engage will be a war of minds, so education of our young must be greatly strengthened. The teaching profession must be a chosen profession with much greater respect and remuneration. However, this cannot be accomplished without first our law enforcement profession being also a most honored and respected profession. This is the profession you have chosen.

In the Marine Corps the highest honor that one can wish for is to be called a good marine. You as police officers must have spotless integrity, uncommon bravery, and complete devotion to duty—then you will be judged by your community with what should be one of the highest community honors—you will be called a good police officer. We need you.

Good luck to you and God bless you.

#### MORE INDIANA SCIENTISTS PLEAD THAT DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the vigorous support of the scientific community for the effort to save the Indiana Dunes is heartening. This support, which has come from the universities and colleges of Indiana, and from throughout the free world, should put to rest the completely untrue claim made by Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other dunes despoilers that nothing of value remains in the dunes to be saved.

On March 7, I had printed in the RECORD at page 3666, the fine letter of the members of the biology department of Notre Dame University which clearly states the uniqueness and irreplaceability of the dunes.

On February 4, I discussed in the Senate the appeal made by 166 scientists and educators working within the State of Indiana that the central section of the dunes be preserved because of the high scientific and recreational values.

Last July, some of the most famous zoologists, biologists, and ornithologists of the world appealed to Northwestern University and other participants in the planned destruction of the key section of the dunes to reconsider their actions. I put a full account of this appeal by European and American scientists in the RECORD of July 27, 1962.

Numerous other individual scientists and scientific associations have written to me and to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, stating their expert opinions that the Indiana Dunes are unique, irreplaceable, and of inestimable scientific and recreational value.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to this irrefutable record by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by 19 members of the faculty of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., which appeared in the Lafayette Journal-Courier of February 22, 1963.

This letter from prominent Hoosiers corrects some of the propaganda of the dunes destroyers and Burns ditch harbor proponents and takes the position which more and more Indiana people are expressing, namely, "We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DUNES VERSUS PORT

The charge is being made that opposition to the State's Burns ditch port plan is heavily financed by Chicago interests attempting to impede Indiana's economic development. None of this is true. The Save-the-Dunes Council has a \$19,000 annual budget derived from dues and contributions from its 3,000 members, and from sale of Christmas cards. The attempt to portray this group of dedicated volunteer workers for conservation, without paid officers, as a sinister economic octopus is ludicrous when one considers the combined forces of officialdom, industry, press, and political power arrayed on the other side. Nevertheless, the undersigned council members and sympathizers deny and resent these reckless accusations against their integrity and motives.

Many pertinent facts have been obscured in the public furor over the proposed Burns ditch port site. Only after persistent urging by Indiana citizens unable to enlist support for dunes conservation from Hoosier politicians did Senator DOUGLAS reluctantly consent to assist the largely Indiana organization, the Save-the-Dunes Council. The unjustified campaign of vilification against him has put our State in a very bad light. If we resent "interference in our sovereign business" by out-of-States, we should stop agitating for Federal funds to build our port.

Far from opposing another lake port in Indiana (although we now have four, two of which are open to public use), Senator DOUGLAS has pledged his influence to obtain generous Federal funds for one, anywhere except in the contested dunes and beach area. It is a question of where, not whether. Specifically, he has accepted (1) the tricity site, for which the 87th Congress appropriated funds for a thorough Army Engineers feasibility

study, and (2) the Burns ditch compromise plan drawn up by the Lake Michigan Region Planning Council, an affiliate of the American Institute of Architects. This plan calls for a canal leading inland to an excavated port behind the strip of dunes in question.

The economic argument for a port at the Burns ditch site is unconvincing. The number of new jobs it would bring about is variously claimed as from 25,000 to 100,000. These figures were picked out of the air, they are hardly confirmed by Bethlehem Steel's announcement of about 2,000 employees for the automated mill it has planned and for which the land is being prepared. Professor Efroymson, Butler University economist, wrote that more economic benefit for Indiana would result in the long run by a lakeshore park to stimulate our tourist industry, than from a port at Burns ditch. Other economists judge that the new jobs there would be more than offset by resulting increased unemployment in the less automated steel mills in Indiana farther west. The United Steelworkers, representing 65,000 Hoosiers, have declared against the Burns ditch site.

The legislators who were given the recent conducted tour have never seen the land in question except in the dead of winter and with the earth scorched by fires set to facilitate clearing and bulldozing. Is their judgment of parkland quality better than that of Interior Secretary Udall and National Park Service authorities who found that the area meets the exacting standards of quality for inclusion in the national park system? Or better than that of the 165 outdoors-oriented Indiana scientists who wrote President Kennedy jointly urging the lakeshore?

We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs.

Preston Adams, Irving W. Burr, Marjorie K. Elsinger, Raymond E. Gilton, Clarence J. Goodnight, Marie L. Goodnight, Arthur T. Guard, Joseph A. Kuc, Alton A. Lindsey, James S. Lovett, Phyllis K. Martin, Melvin G. Mellon, Russell E. Mumford, Elroy L. Rice, Sumner A. Rifenburgh, Oscar G. Ward, Jr., Barbara Webster, Grady Webster, and Arthur H. Westing.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Stanley Surrey, spoke recently before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia about the President's tax program.

As there is so much misinformation about the program, I think it important that Members of the Congress and the public generally have access to Mr. Surrey's remarks where he explains factually just what many of the proposals would do.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE TAX PROGRAM IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., February 28, 1963)

#### THE BACKGROUND—WIDESPREAD CRITICISM OF THE TAX STRUCTURE

Throughout the postwar period there has been increasing recognition that the Federal income-tax structure deserved revision. It has been criticized on the ground that its high rates are a heritage of war and postwar inflationary pressure, and that these

rates dull initiative, destroy incentives, and inhibit risktaking.

There have also been charges that our tax law contains special preferences, which discriminate without justification among taxpayers and contribute to gross unfairness. The many exclusions and deductions have been blamed for unduly narrowing the tax base, contributing to the need for high rates. The tax system has been blamed for showing favoritism to some industries and transactions, and distorting the allocation of resources in the economy as well as interfering with the free play of market forces. As a result of all this, the energies and talents of many people—including a great number of highly skilled executives and professional people—have been taken up devising intricate schemes to take maximum advantage of opportunities for tax reduction.

It is hardly surprising, then, that criticism of our tax system became more insistent as the postwar period lengthened. The Congress took account of such criticism in 1955 and 1959, when, under the leadership of Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, noteworthy studies of our tax system were made. Considerable testimony from professional experts was compiled in these studies, not merely on the criticisms themselves, but on the possible lines of improvement which might be taken.

That was the situation when President Kennedy took office. He immediately set tax revision as one of the major domestic goals of his administration. He made his views clear in his first tax message to the Congress, in April of 1961. In that message he urged the adoption of an investment tax credit as a stimulus to spur investment and accelerate growth, proposed a series of specific tax reforms, and ordered a Treasury study of additional, broader changes in the income tax structure.

The Congress responded with the Revenue Act of 1962, containing both the investment tax credit and significant reform provisions in almost all of the areas recommended by the President—in all nearly a billion dollars of tax reform to roughly match the revenue lost by the investment credit. A significant first step in revision of the tax structure was thus accomplished.

#### YEAR 1963—THE CASE FOR TAX REVISION BECOMES IMPERATIVE

The year 1963, however, brought a new dimension to the situation. The tax revision that all had agreed was one of our desirable domestic goals came to be recognized as imperative to our economic health.

We have seen four recessions since the end of World War II. We have seen unplanned deficits resulting from a failure of the economy to achieve levels of operation consistent with its potential in terms of capital, manpower, and productivity. The gap between our potential and our actual performance—now about \$40 billion in terms of lost gross national product per year—is evident in unused industrial capacity, high unemployment, and a lagging rate of capital formation. As a result we are running the risk of recessions that could cut deeper and last longer, followed by shorter recoveries. Furthermore, the America we all want—with full employment, with more and better schools, health facilities, and public services, with urban redevelopment on a faster and larger scale, with better living standards for all—will come about far more quickly through an economy yielding us all that our resources in men and capital are capable of producing.

The overwhelming weight of economic analysis indicates that the income tax structure presses too heavily on the economy. Its especially high individual income tax rates, starting at 20 percent, sweep too much out of private hands in relation to our GNP, so that consumer demand is kept throttled

down in periods of recovery. The rate structure, rising to 91 percent, means high marginal tax rates that deter incentive, risk taking, and personal effort, thereby lessening the contribution that private initiative is able to make. The corporate tax rate, at 52 percent, unduly limits the profitability of corporate investment and presents corporate management with the fact that the shareholders are the lesser and the Government the greater partner in the enterprises they guide. Added to all this is the waste arising from the distortions induced by the special preferences—the uneconomic allocation of resources, the talents and time lost in the pursuit of tax schemes, the resentments created by the gross unfairnesses.

We thus come to these conclusions—the America we want and the America we must have to meet our international obligations and hazards can be obtained only by a more productive economy. We possess the resources required for a higher level of economic activity. Our task is to secure the full utilization of those resources. The most effective way to achieve that full utilization is to revise the tax system. Tax revision, by removing the present tax restraints on the private sector, will enable it to provide the force and initiative so necessary to economic vitality. Tax revision—for long acknowledged as a desirable thing to do—is now of paramount economic importance.

#### THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE RATE REDUCTIONS

In full recognition of the imperative of tax revision, the President's tax program recommends large reductions in the rate scale and significant structural changes. Combined these mean, in full operation, a reduction of \$10.3 billion in tax liabilities—about 15 percent of our present individual and corporate tax liabilities. Let us start with the major reform of the tax structure, the reduction in tax rates. The present individual rates run from 20 percent in the bottom bracket of \$2,000 to \$4,000 for a married couple—to 91 percent at the top. President Kennedy's tax program would start the tax scale at 14 percent on the first \$1,000 to \$2,000 for a married couple—and rise to a maximum of 65 percent. The intermediate rates are all pulled down—the present marginal rate of 30 percent for the \$15,000 married man would be 24 percent, of 43 percent for the \$25,000 man would be 34 percent. The 50-percent marginal rate now reached at \$32,000 would be reached at \$52,000. The 60-percent marginal rate now reached at \$52,000 would not be reached until \$140,000. These large reductions in the marginal tax rates—the rates on added dollars of income—show the significant increase in incentives inherent in the program.

The resulting rate scale means a reduction of \$11 billion in individual income tax liabilities.

On the corporate side our present rates are 30 percent on the first \$25,000 of income and 52 percent on the remainder. The proposed tax rates would be 22 percent on the first \$25,000 and 47 percent on the balance. The 22 percent rate for small business—a rate which would apply to 80 percent of all tax-paying corporations—is a reduction of 27 percent. It means a significant lift for a large segment of American enterprise. The 47-percent rate is a 10-percent reduction, so that the reduction for the corporations above \$25,000 ranges in between—it is 16 percent for a \$50,000 corporation, 12 percent for a \$100,000 corporation. The overall reduction in corporate tax liabilities is \$2.6 billion. This reduction is about the same as that obtained in 1962, when over \$2 billion of corporation tax liabilities were removed through the combined effect of the investment credit and administrative revision of the depreciation rules. The resulting total would mean that overall corporate tax lia-

bilities would be reduced by nearly 20 percent.

These reductions would thus achieve a sizable lowering of the individual and corporate rate structures. In terms of increased incentives, of increased private resources available for consumer spending and capital investment, of a significant lessening of the weight of the tax system on all private enterprise and activity, of the impetus given to cost cutting and improvements in productive efficiency, the new rates represent the most significant of the reforms of the tax system that the program embodies. They are a direct and effective response to the need for loosening the present tax restraints on the economy. They recognize that the achievement of a greater level of economic recovery and more rapid growth cannot rest either on increased consumer spending alone or on increased incentives and savings for investment alone. Both are vitally needed, consumer demand to press on existing and future capacity to bring us to full employment and lead to a higher level of investment; the investment incentives to stimulate us to go on to a higher level of capital formation and economic growth. The rate reductions pull back the entire rate structure, individual and corporate, from top to bottom.

#### THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The major reform in the tax program is thus the large reduction in tax rates. These reductions are complemented by—and their revenue cost partially offset by—a number of proposed structural changes. These structural changes are not all in one direction—some involve revenue losses and some revenue gains, some affect corporations and some individuals, some are directly associated with changes in the rate structure and some are required by the objectives of eliminating hardships, unfairness, and unjustified preferences.

Individual structural changes that lose revenue: On the individual side, a number of structural changes are proposed to remove particular hardships and unfairnesses that rate reduction by itself will not rectify. Thus, at the lower end of the scale, the insistence by many that exemptions be raised has been prompted by the realization that an income tax reaching as low as \$667 for single persons and \$1,333 for married couples taxes persons in the area of real poverty. Rate reductions alone obviously cannot meet this problem. Yet the solution of raising exemptions by \$100 would mean a revenue loss of \$2.5 billion under proposed rates and remove 3 million taxpayers from the rolls; an increase of \$200 in exemptions means a revenue loss of almost \$5 billion and removal of 6½ million taxpayers. This exemption approach is wasteful of revenue, since its effects reach beyond the lower levels where the particular relief is needed, and is often overgenerous where family size is large. Of the \$2.5 billion of revenue that would be lost through a \$100 increase in exemptions, only 20 percent or \$500 million would go to the group below \$5,000.

As a more appropriate solution the program proposes a minimum standard deduction of \$300 for a single person and an additional \$100 for a spouse and for each dependent. As a consequence, single persons below \$900, married persons below \$1,600, and married persons with two dependents below \$3,000 cease to be taxable—as compared with \$667, \$1,333, and \$2,666 levels of today. The revenue loss is only \$310 million, concentrated almost entirely in the group below \$5,000. Yet this approach achieves in the lowest income range the equivalent of an exemption increase of as much as \$233 for a single person, of as much as \$133 for each spouse of the married couple, and of as much as \$83 for each member of the



family of four. About 1.5 million persons would become nontaxable by this proposal.

In short, the minimum standard deduction proposal uses the deduction factor of the tax computation as a technique to achieve a fair adjustment of the tax burdens at the lowest levels of income, in preference to the more traditional, yet wastefully expensive technique, of raising exemptions.

Another hardship that tax rate reduction alone cannot meet is the present complex and discriminatory treatment of the aged. Present law embodies an extra \$600 exemption—which at higher income levels is unnecessary and thus a revenue waste—and a complicated retirement income credit designed to give pensioners and those receiving investment income a tax reduction somewhat comparable to the exclusion of social security benefits from income. Its effect is to discriminate against all those over 65 who receive earned income—about three out of every four taxpayers over 65. The consequent unfairness among the aged in the income levels below \$10,000, depending on source of income, are too great to tolerate—a tax of zero for a \$3,000 income from interest and rent, but a tax of \$300 if wages are the only source of income. And again the credit is unneeded in the upper levels.

The tax program proposes to substitute for all this a flat \$300 credit against tax for each person over age 65. Recognition of the present social security exclusion is taken account of in the proposal. This is done by reducing the credit by an amount based on one-half of social security benefits times the taxpayer's bracket or marginal tax rate. This procedure reflects the fact that both the employee and employer contribute equally to the benefits. The cost of this change is \$320 million, one-half of which goes to persons below the \$5,000 income level and most of the balance to those with incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000. This change would thus continue the present policy that age is a factor justifying tax relief, and then provide a mechanism which both grants that relief in a fair and simple way and confines it to the income levels where it is needed most.

A third structural change under the individual income tax also meets a hardship which rate reduction cannot solve—that faced by the person with fluctuating yearly income. While fluctuating incomes may be more characteristic of people in certain occupations, such as authors, artists, actors, athletes, ranchers, fisherman, farmers, architects, and individual business proprietorships, it obviously may be experienced in many other situations. The combination of graduated tax rates and an irregular pattern of income produces more tax today over a period of years than does a stable income pattern. The tax program meets this hardship by a uniform averaging formula applicable to all, under which income is, in effect, averaged over a 5-year period whenever the current year's income is significantly higher than the average of the preceding 4 years. The revenue cost is about \$40 million.

A fourth structural change, involving a revenue cost of \$50 million, is aimed at meeting the hardship experienced by persons who must incur moving expenses for themselves and their families as a consequence of a change in employment. The burden can often be severe and its impact, apart from hardship, can be such as to place an undesirable restriction on labor mobility. The tax program proposes a deduction for these moving expenses, both for a transferred person who continues to work for the same employer and for a person who changes his employer.

The remaining individual structural changes that lose revenue smooth out or extend existing provisions respecting certain expenditures. One change would expand the

benefits of the child-care provision (revenue cost 20 billion); another would apply the 30-percent limitation uniformly to all publicly supported charities, thereby replacing the present distinctions between a 20-percent and a 30-percent limitation for these charities (revenue cost nominal); and a third would clarify and simplify the medical expense deduction (revenue cost nominal).

In sum, this group of reforms, which in total involve a revenue cost of \$740 million, will thus meet some of the persistent and well-founded complaints regarding the hardships resulting today, not from the present rate scale but from the operation of the tax structure even under a reasonable rate scale. They deal with specific unfairnesses requiring specific reforms for their cure. It is just as important to the persons affected, in terms of fairness under an income tax, that their problems be met as it is to those whose objections are directed to the present rate scales. Moreover, these changes have a considerable bearing on the economic scene in terms of labor mobility and allocation of individual skills. This group of reforms or structural changes thus contributes significantly to the insistent urgings for improvement in the tax structure.

Individual structural changes that gain revenue: The remaining individual structural changes involve revenue gains. The most significant from a revenue standpoint is the proposed floor on deductions for personal expenses—interest, charitable contributions, State and local taxes, medical expenses, casualty losses. Under this proposal only the total of those expenses above 5 percent of adjusted gross income would be deductible. A consideration of this proposal in its proper perspective requires that we go back to the origin and effect of the standard deduction. The Congress in 1944 adopted our present standard deduction of 10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a \$1,000 maximum as a device to simplify the tax law. Since the 10-percent figure chosen was somewhat above the average of those expenses then being itemized as deductions, the policy also eliminated any distinctions between itemizers and nonitemizers among taxpayers below or around the average level.

Since 1944 there has been a considerable growth in the average amount of these personal expenses, as a result of rising income levels, rising costs, and changing habits. In 1944, about 35 million returns used the standard deduction and only 8 million used itemized deductions; in 1962 the figures were 26 and 25 million respectively. In 1944, the standard deduction represented 63 percent of the total of all deductions for these personal expenses; in 1962 this figure had dropped to 23 percent. In 1944 the itemized and standard deductions combined represented about 10 percent of adjusted gross income; in 1962 they represented about 15 percent. The standard deduction now comes to \$12½ billion. The itemized deductions come to \$41 billion, used by taxpayers with an adjusted gross income of \$217 billion, or about 20 percent. In 1944, the itemized deductions amounted to only \$4.8 billion, used by taxpayers with \$32.5 billion adjusted gross income, or about 14 percent. This is the key figure, for it indicates the persistent narrowing of the tax base that has occurred in postwar years as a result of the large increase in amount of itemized deductions—from 14 percent to 20 percent of the adjusted gross income of the returns involved. Paraphrasing, by contrast the total of personal exemptions has dropped from about 40 to 27 percent of adjusted gross income.

The standard deduction represents a congressional policy of eliminating distinctions between itemization and nonitemization of expenses at the level of average expenses for taxpayers with incomes below \$10,000. Underlying this policy was a desire for simplification and a willingness to recognize that

some of the rental expenses of the renter reflected personal expense akin to those of the homeowner. In view of the increase in these personal expenses relative to gross income, it is obvious that if we were today adopting the policy of the standard deduction for the first time, the appropriate figure would be about 15 percent instead of 10 percent, with a limit perhaps of \$1,500. But in the meantime we have seen that the narrowing of the tax base represented by the rise in personal expenses is a factor in keeping marginal rates at an excessively high level. A standard deduction at 15 percent would also have a base-narrowing effect and mean a loss of revenue. The intent behind the standard deduction, however, can be as well expressed through a different mechanism, that of placing a floor under itemized deductions. Instead then of a standard deduction of 15 percent, the objectives can be achieved by continuing the standard deduction of 10 percent and adopting a 5-percent floor under itemized deductions. This policy would, of course, gain revenue. Since it would be adopted to keep the base from narrowing and thereby keeping or forcing tax rates up, it is appropriate that the revenue gained be devoted to a lowering of the rates.

The policies behind the standard deduction—simplification and a balanced allowance to all taxpayers of the average of personal expenses—today in the light of the great increase in personal expenses would thus appear to require either a rise in the standard deduction or a floor under itemized deductions. The expression of that policy through an increase in the standard deduction would contribute to further narrowing of the tax base and would necessitate higher rates. An expression of that policy in the 5-percent floor will broaden the tax base and permit a far larger reduction in marginal tax rates. Some may feel that the continuation, through the use of a floor, of this policy of achieving some balance in the recognition of personal expenses raises problems, especially in those brackets where the itemizers and nonitemizers are both significantly represented. Expression could be given to this viewpoint by combining a floor on itemized deductions with some comparable reduction in the standard deduction.

The combination of the 5-percent floor and rate reduction will leave itemizers with significant tax reductions. Further, the 5-percent floor will not reduce the incentives that the deductions for personal expenses seek to encourage, such as home ownership or charitable contributions. Itemized expenses today average about 20 percent of adjusted gross income, so that most of present expenses and, of course, all new expenses are above the floor. Those, for example, who have expressed fears over reduced charitable or educational giving should be relieved of their worries when they study the facts. Clearly for most itemizers the present non-discretionary expenses of State taxes, mortgage interest, and medical expenses are obviously above a 5-percent floor. Voluntary charitable contributions, therefore, would be fully deductible. Moreover, despite the forebodings of some of these institutions in 1944 when the standard deduction was adopted—and 80 percent of taxpayers were shifted to that method—charitable giving was not adversely affected. Finally, the volume of charitable giving appears to depend primarily on the level of income—for years it has been about 2 percent of national personal income despite changes in tax rates and structure. The tax program will not only increase the after-tax incomes of individuals but through its effect on the economy will greatly increase national personal income. A rise in that income from the present \$440 to \$525 billion—which could be achieved under the tax program—would alone increase charitable giving from its present \$8.8 to \$10.5 billion.

The 5-percent floor is thus not only in keeping with the policies behind the standard deduction, but it also expresses those policies in a manner that permits a larger tax rate reduction than would otherwise be possible. The revenue gain from the floor is \$2.3 billion. If this \$2.3 billion were not thus available, then the rate scale would have to be raised, primarily in the middle and upper brackets if the revenue involved were to be distributed in the same fashion as reflected by the floor. This would mean top bracket marginal tax rates would be scaled to 75 percent and not 65 percent.

The 5-percent floor, while keeping the essential policies underlying the deductions for personal expenses, also contributes to a rate scale more conducive to personal incentives and economic well being. The basic point is to preserve and strengthen all of the incentives that are important—both those involved in the deductions for personal expenses and those involved in lower marginal tax rates—and the combination of the 5-percent floor and the lower rate scale it permits achieves this result.

The remaining individual revenue-raising changes raise about \$700 million—an amount equal to the revenue-losing changes. Two of the changes are associated with reductions in the rates, especially the top rates, and would remove preferences or escapes not justifiable under lowered top rates. The proposal to eliminate the dividend credit and exclusion would alone recover \$460 million in tax revenue. Nearly 80 percent of the benefits of these provisions presently goes to taxpayers over \$10,000, and over 50 percent to those over \$20,000. Even as to the exclusion only 15 percent of its benefits goes to persons under \$5,000, with 60 percent of the benefits to those over \$10,000. This, of course, is merely a reflection of the concentration of corporate ownership and dividends in middle and upper income groups. In 1960 only 5 percent of the returns under \$5,000 reported dividends, which dividends amounted to one percent of the total adjusted gross income on these returns; these returns accounted for 14 percent of dividends reported. Returns over \$20,000 accounted for 60 percent of the dividends, and almost all returns reported some dividends; these dividends represent 10 percent of adjusted gross income at \$20,000, 20 percent at \$50,000 and 40 percent above \$200,000.

It is appropriate to eliminate this special preference for dividends, which has achieved no useful economic purpose, at a time when the individual rate scale is being lowered and the corporate rate also reduced. The incentives for investment and risk-taking which these lower rates provide would be far more significant in their impact on the economy than the dividend credit and exclusion. Moreover, the 5-point proposed reduction in the corporate rate will give more relief from double taxation than does the 4 percent credit for incomes up to \$186,000. The credit reduces double taxation by amounts ranging from 4.3 percent for taxpayers in the first bracket to 10.4 percent in the proposed top bracket. The five-point reduction in the corporate tax rate would reduce double taxation by 10 percent for everyone. The other proposal related to the rates is a tightening of the personal holding company rules, to end the escapes from individual taxation now available through the use of these devices to shelter investment income or income from personal efforts.

The other revenue-gaining changes would eliminate undesirable or inequitable preferences that now exist and improve existing rules. These involve elimination of the sick-pay exclusion; the taxation to the employee of the value of the economic benefit of employer-provided group term life insurance above a minimum figure, in keeping with the present tax treatment of other forms of employer-provided insurance; the institu-

tion of a 4-percent floor under casualty losses comparable to that under medical expenses, and the elimination of the unlimited charitable deduction.

In sum, the revenue-raising structural changes in the individual area—seven in number—involve about \$3 billion, of which \$2.3 billion is concentrated in the 5 percent floor and \$700 million in the remaining items. They offset to this extent the \$11.7 billion revenue loss involved in a rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent and the \$740 million of changes needed to eliminate hardships that cannot be reached by rate reduction. They represent reforms responsive to the persistent urgings that our tax structure be altered to keep the tax base from constantly narrowing and to eliminate unfair preferences. They involve no departures from basic income tax concepts and no complications of technical implementation. They clearly do not broaden the individual tax base as much as some have urged. At the same time, they represent significant improvements in the tax structure. Together with the changes designed to eliminate hardships, they contribute to a balanced program of revision in the tax structure.

Corporate structural changes: The structural changes in the corporate tax are few in number. Two are associated with the reduction of the normal tax on the first \$25,000 of corporate income from 30 to 22 percent. The normal tax concept represents a policy designed to assist "small business" and the reduction in this rate—a 27-percent reduction—will strengthen that assistance. It is important that this tax benefit—and the consequent revenue loss—be confined to what are truly small businesses. However, we find that enterprises and activities which are conducted with multiple corporate structures could obtain this small business tax benefit many times over if each corporation in the structure were taxed at only 22 percent on its first \$25,000 of income. It is obvious that a rational application of a tax policy designed to assist small business requires aggregation of corporations under common ownership before the \$25,000 test is applied. This is so whether the multiple corporations serve genuine business purposes or are simply tax motivated. It may be observed that eligibility for the other nontax small business benefits accorded by the Congress is determined on such a consolidated basis.

The tax program, in order to make possible the reduction of the small business rate to 22 percent, thus proposes only a single surtax exemption for multiple corporation enterprises, the change to be phased over 5 years. The revenue gain is \$120 million. At the same time, in further application of this policy of neutralizing the tax effect of multiple corporate structures, it is proposed that the two percent additional tax on consolidated returns be eliminated and that intercorporate dividends between affiliated corporations not be taxes. The revenue cost is \$50 million.

These two structural changes are thus directly linked to the new corporate rate structure. Of the remaining structural changes, one that costs revenue (\$50 million) would permit the current expensing of equipment used in research and development activities, with the objective of encouraging the expansion of private civilian research. A change that would gain revenue (about \$250 million, of which \$10 million comes from individuals) involves improvements in the taxation of natural resource activities designed to carry out the purposes behind the existing depletion policies.

In sum, these corporate structural changes, few in number, involve revenue costs of \$100 million and gains of \$360 million. They reduce the \$2.63 billion of corporate rate reduction to about \$2.3 billion. Here also a balance is preserved, with the changes pro-

posed being either necessitated by the new rate structure or designed to meet particular problems in the corporate area. A further significant structural change—the acceleration in the current corporate tax payment of larger corporations—would yield \$1.5 billion in annual budget receipts in the next 5 years but would not increase tax liabilities.

#### THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION— THE CAPITAL GAIN CHANGES

The final set of recommendations in the tax program relates to the area of capital gains and losses. This area has always involved complex tax issues, since it is necessary to give proper weight to a number of factors that do not all work in the same direction—the fact that capital gains accrue over time and arise from a variety of economic causes; the importance of encouraging private risk-taking and initiative; the importance of maintaining the flow and mobility of capital, and the need to maintain on equity grounds an appropriate relationship to the taxation of other types of profit and income. Our present system, for individuals, is to include only 50 percent of capital gains, limit the taxation of the gain to a maximum rate of 25 percent, and permit the gain represented by appreciation accumulated until death to escape income taxation entirely.

The tax program proposes several basic changes, whose primary objective is to achieve increased mobility of capital and encourage private risk-taking. First, it would reduce the present 50 percent inclusion ratio to only 30 percent of the gain. With a proposed basic rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, capital gains would thus be taxed at a scale running from 4.2 to 19.5 percent. This is far lower than the present range of 10 percent at \$2,000 of taxable income to 25 percent at about \$32,000 and higher on a joint return. The proposed rate at \$32,000 of taxable income would only be 12 percent. The combination of reducing the 50 percent inclusion to 30 percent, and then reducing the basic rate scale, thus involves reductions in capital gains tax ranging from 58 percent for first-bracket taxpayers to 52 percent for taxpayers at \$32,000, 40 percent at \$52,000, 30 percent at \$100,000, on down to 22 percent for top-bracket taxpayers. The benefits would be concerned mainly in the middle and upper income groups. Nearly 50 percent of present capital gains are realized by persons with incomes between \$10,000 and \$100,000, and these gains represent 3 percent of adjusted gross income at \$10,000 and about 20 percent at \$100,000. A complementary provision would extend the present 5-year carryover of capital losses to an unlimited carryover (revenue cost of \$20 million). The corporate capital gain rate would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

A significant obstacle to the mobility of capital today, and one which "locks in" many an investor, is the inducement under present rules to hold an appreciated asset until death so that the gain will escape tax. The tax program would end this lock-in effect by treating as a taxable capital gain any gain present in assets transferred at death. The advantage in capital mobility, with consequent benefits to increased initiative and risk-taking, would be highly beneficial to economic growth. The revenue gain involved would offset the cost of the lowered capital gain rates and make those rates possible. The result is an integrated treatment of capital gains and losses that should have a large positive effect on increasing investment and capital formation.

Necessarily the proposal to tax gains transferred at death—which will affect annually only about 3 percent of decedents—must be implemented by technical rules designed to permit as fair and as practical an applica-



tion of this approach as is possible—such as the exemption of the gain on a residence and on personal or household effects, the exemption of gains passing to a wife along the lines of the present estate tax marital deduction, a blanket \$15,000 exemption of gain to eliminate small estates, an exemption of transfers to charity, an averaging device, provisions to ease the time of payment of the tax, a transition period before the new rule is to become fully effective, and so on.

The benefits to taxpayers and the economy of the new low rates on capital gains turn also on one other necessary change, that of a reexamination of the definition of capital gains. If something called a capital gain is to be included to the extent of only 30 percent of the gain—as compared to a 100-percent inclusion for wages, salaries, business profits, interest, dividends, and so on—it becomes imperative that the present eligibility rules defining capital gains be considerably tightened. It is in this area, even under the present capital gain rates, that the suggestions for reforms to end the special preferences resulting from ordinary income items being classified as capital gain have been perhaps the most insistent. With capital gain rates being reduced by 22 to 58 percent, the existing definitional rules would involve intolerable special preferences and inequities. The tax program therefore proposes a number of definitional changes which can be grouped into three categories: One, the proposal that the holding period be extended from 6 months to a year. Two, changes affecting the interrelationship of ordinary deductions and capital gain, designed to extend the approach of the 1962 act under which that part of the gain on the sale of an asset that represents prior deductions would be treated as ordinary income—these changes affect the real-estate shelter, sales of oil and other natural resource interests, and certain sales of cattle and farm assets. Three, changes affecting ordinary income items now treated as capital gains, designed to reverse this characterization where appropriate—these changes affect such items as employee stock options, lump-sum distributions under pension and profit-sharing plans, the sale of patents, the cutting or sale of timber, and the sale of life estates. Some of these provisions either came into or remained in the law as an offset to the high marginal top rates. With a reduction in those rates to 65 percent and lower, for this reason alone these provisions are no longer justifiable.

The direct revenue effect of all the changes is a gain of \$100 million, assuming the present character and volume of transactions. However, the increased turnover of assets resulting from the unlocking of asset holdings, together with the net effects on transactions of the other changes, is expected to yield an additional \$650 million.

These then are the main details of the tax program. We believe the program is a balanced one, treating all levels of income and all types of taxpayers as fairly as possible. It is difficult to obtain any precise measure or index of the distribution of its benefits. Some may point to the percentage change in tax liability at each income level, and show that the highest percentages of reduction are in the bottom and the lowest at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result we must remember it fails to reflect the proportion of total tax liabilities paid at each level. Some may point to the percentage increase in after-tax incomes, and show that the highest percentage is at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result, it does fail to reflect the impact of the present rate scales which, under almost any program, would produce such an after-tax effect. Moreover, in any allocation of the benefits, it is necessary to remember that the corporate rate changes and the capital gain changes will yield large benefits to the mid-

dle and upper income groups, first through the increase in dividends consequent upon higher corporate after-tax profits and second through lower capital gain rates combined with increased mobility of capital. It is difficult to quantify these benefits.

We believe that when all the changes are considered, and their effects weighed as carefully as possible, the overall result is a distribution that bears a close relationship to the present pattern except where relief for the extremes of low income hardship or old age are involved.

It is at this point that we must consider the final dimension of the tax program, that of its relationship to the current economic climate. Three aspects stand out: One, we are faced with an economy which while sluggish is still moving slowly upward. This means that the program need not be geared to a shot-in-the-arm approach to ward off an immediate recession threat. Instead, the tax program can be responsive to the insistent demands for a basic tax revision that will make a lasting contribution to economic growth and lessen the risk of recurring recessions. It also means that while tax reduction is an imperative, there is legislative time to work out this year, with effective and expeditious action, a properly constructed bill.

Second, we are faced with a deficit for fiscal 1964 that, apart from the tax program, would be \$9.2 billion. While this deficit is the direct consequence of an economy moving at a slow rate, which the tax program is intended to accelerate, care must be taken that the costs of tax reduction are handled in a fiscally responsible manner to keep the transitional deficit within prudent bounds. The tax program meets this requirement, one additional to the substantive issues of tax revision, in three ways: One, the rate reductions are staged over 3 years, commencing in 1963, with the structural changes starting essentially in 1964; two, appropriate structural changes keep the overall revenue cost of the rate reductions within a prudent figure of \$10.3 billion; three, another structural change—the proposal to accelerate under a 5-year transition the payments of estimate tax of the larger corporations—will improve the budget picture by about \$1.5 billion so that the budgetary cost of the program is an overall \$8.8 billion before any feedback.

A third aspect of our present situation is that we must end our unplanned deficits and move on to a budget balance at a high level of employment. As far as the tax program is concerned, this means an effect on the economy that will produce sufficient revenues for this purpose. It is believed that the large rate reductions and the effects of the entire program on consumer spending and investment incentives will permit the economy rapidly to move to new heights. At these higher levels of gross national product, the resulting revenues even under reduced rates will be in excess of our present revenues. The difference, of course, is that the resulting dynamic economy will be able to maintain these higher revenues, whereas our present sluggish economy finds the tax structure an impediment to growth.

But revenues are only one side of the budget. The other requirement is firm control over expenditure policy. The President and the Budget Director have made these matters clear: one, civilian expenditures will be firmly controlled, and in the 1964 budget have been reduced; two, defense and space expenditures should begin to level off; and third, as the tax reduction becomes fully effective, and the economy moves upward, a part of the revenue increases must go to eliminating the deficit.

Under this combination of revenue increases and a budgetary policy of firm expenditure control, we can move on to a balanced budget and full employment. To be

sure, certain assumptions and expectations respecting the economic response to the tax program underlie this belief. But we must remember that the alternative course would not be without its set of assumptions and expectations. Indeed, in the light of the history of our business cycles, without tax action the risks become far greater of a recession coming and of its lasting longer and cutting deeper. Such a recession would increase the deficit far more than the program, without affording even any hope of improvement or offset.

#### CONCLUSION

The tax program is responsive to two main requirements. First, it responds to the imperative need for the large reductions in individual, corporate, and capital gain rates required now to enable the economy to reach its full potential for output and growth, while at the same time permitting these rate reductions to be achieved in a fiscally responsible manner compatible with the deficit condition of the budget. Second, it responds to the long-felt need for a revision of the income tax structure that would scale down the rates, broaden the tax base, eliminate serious hardships, and end unjustifiable abuses and preferences. The program thus fits into the efforts that commenced with the Revenue Act of 1962 to achieve the tax revision which the earlier studies of the Congress delineated as vitally necessary.

As the President has firmly and consistently stated, the core and central theme of the tax program are the large reductions in all the tax rates—reductions that remove the restraints now imposed by the tax system on the economy and on incentives for private initiative. The cost of these reductions, plus the elimination of hardships which the rate reductions cannot reach comes to over \$14 billion. The revenue gained from structural changes, important in themselves as contributing to equity and economic growth, and from increased mobility through capital gains revisions will bring that cost down to \$10.3 billion. A further structural change, the acceleration of corporate payments, reduces this figure to a budgetary cost, before feedback, of \$8.8 billion. The structural changes thus bring the rate reductions within a budgetary cost that is clearly fiscally responsible. If these structural changes are to be substantially altered, the overall program would, therefore, have to be reshaped by significantly limiting the rate reductions—so that we would not achieve an individual rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, a corporate rate reduction to 47 percent, and elimination of hardship for the poor and the aged—thus significantly lessening the effect on the economy and on incentives; or it must be reshaped by increasing the cost and budgetary impact of the program, or by some combination of these approaches. Naturally, it is not necessary to enact all the changes exactly as proposed. But a measure designed to provide the maximum effect on the economy through rate reductions and to do so in a manner most consonant with appropriate fiscal responsibility would involve some structural changes of one sort or another.

These are decisions which must and will be made in Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means has commenced its consideration of the tax program. It will shape a tax bill that takes account of the helpful criticisms and suggestions which the legislative process produces. The Treasury Department will fully cooperate in this process.

In the process of moving forward with a tax program so vitally needed, we must not let all of the detailed bits and pieces inevitable in tax legislation obscure the objectives we are seeking to accomplish. The total is far more than the bits and pieces, far more than how each of our individual pocket-books is affected, far more than how much tax reduction this or that person gets in

1963, or in 1964 or in 1965. The total is a revision of our income tax which will enable us to achieve, as far as it lies within the power and effect of the tax system, the strong and growing economy which is vital to the kind of America we all desire.

#### THE McNAMARA MONARCHY?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." Mr. Baldwin is one of the world's foremost military affairs writers. He is the military editor of the New York Times where he has worked since 1929. In 1944 he won a Pulitzer Prize for his reporting on the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Baldwin's article raises questions that have been giving serious concern to many of us in recent months. We have no objection to bright young men participating in the military affairs of this country. On the other hand, some of us believe that there is a tendency to disregard the experienced military advisers in the Defense Department. The TFX contract is now under investigation. Without passing on the merits of that controversy, a question is naturally raised when four evaluation boards are reversed. The controversy of the Skybolt is well known. Some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate bowed to the slowp on the RS-70 on the assurance that the Skybolt would give the B-52 a longer life. This was done, I am sure, with some misgivings. But the Skybolt, notwithstanding previous assurance to our committees, has been canceled.

Four committees of the Congress consistently urged the development of the B-70—now called the RS-70—as a complete weapons system. Those committees are the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services. Repeatedly, we have given Secretary McNamara more money than he requested but he has refused to spend it.

I believe that Members of Congress would be interested in what Mr. Baldwin has to say in his article. I believe that the questions he raises will be matters of continuing discussion here in the Congress. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE McNAMARA MONARCHY (By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel, "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation, the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

#### PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the State-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politico-military power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than \$20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual

services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a party line from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January 1963, issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for strategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yes-men and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses and computer calculations, but without the moral courage of leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

#### COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide-rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat-effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced compromises. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and ad-



ministration are directed from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "the book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting, budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paper work and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 15 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearranged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law—a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "greater general staff"—to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five to six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of top-ranking, high-salaried personnel—particularly civil service top grades—assigned to the Office of the Secretary, the Department of Defense, and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS-14 to 18 brackets (the top-salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of \$11,355 to a top of \$17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of \$12,845 and a top of \$20,000 in 1962.

This top-heavy system has obviously built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no military requirement for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated, or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS-70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile, and the Nike-Zeus antiballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

#### CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened

by the loosening of congressional control over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in executive power, and the weakness and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge \* \* \* honest differences of (service) opinion and free expression \* \* \* in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of "everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform \* \* \* to the dead level of mediocrity, jacks of all trades, masters of none, a group of 'Yes' men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy."

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of democracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

#### EXPORT AND TOURISM EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE, Mr. President, last Monday, March 4, the President's E Award for export promotion was conferred upon the Air Transport Association of America in recognition of that organization's significant contribution to our Nation's export and tourism expansion program.

The Air Transport Association, which was founded in 1936, is the national trade and service organization of the U.S. scheduled airlines, both domestic and international. It has long been a leader in our country's endeavors to facilitate and promote international travel and trade.

In presenting the E Award to ATA's President Stuart G. Tipton, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said this:

The Air Transport Association of America has worked continuously to develop travel to the United States. Its international promotion efforts, through a wide variety of programs, have stirred interest in tourism overseas, and its program to streamline requirements and procedures to visitors has resulted in the elimination of many time-consuming formalities. It has worked

assiduously to promote exports and obtain more simplified shipping requirements. These efforts reflect credit on the organization and our private enterprise system, and constitute a substantial contribution to the export expansion programs of the United States.

Secretary Hodges echoes precisely my own sentiments and, I am certain, those of many other Members of this body. As one who has long urged increased efforts to increase American trade and thereby improve our balance-of-payments position and stem the gold flow, I commend the Air Transport Association for its constructive program and the Department of Commerce for its work in promoting exports and attracting tourists. I think the conferring of this award is a timely reminder to all of us of the tremendous importance to the Nation of the U.S. flag air transport industry and of its conspicuous achievements in international commerce and trade.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA SIOUX INDIANS POINT THE WAY TO BETTER LIFE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most urgent challenges confronting the Nation today is the necessity of raising standards of life on our American Indian reservations. It is well known that health, housing educational and job opportunities for the American Indian lag far behind conditions for our citizens as a whole.

It is gratifying to note that with the cooperation of public authorities, the Indian tribes have been making an effort to build a better life for themselves and their children. I am especially pleased with progress that has been made by the South Dakota Sioux Indians on the Pine Ridge reservation. This reservation became the center for the first public housing program for American Indians when the Kennedy administration declared Indians eligible for such assistance under the public housing authority. The Pine Ridge reservation has also pioneered in the field of industrial job development.

Both of these encouraging steps have been well reported in a series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves, staff reporter for the Washington Post. As Mr. Graves points out, attorney Richard Schifter of Washington, D.C., who represents the Oglala Sioux, was a prime mover in instigating these two hopeful developments. I commend the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Graves' two articles to date appearing in the Washington Post of March 10 and March 11 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1963]  
IN WELTER OF CITIES, THE RED MAN WITHERS  
(By Aubrey Graves)

An almost complete about face has occurred in the past decade in the Federal Government's manner of dealing with Indians living on reservations.

During the 1950's, policies pushed by Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer were put into effect looking toward early termination of the Government's trusteeship. The Bureau of Indian Affairs undertook a national

program of relocation assistance for Indian "volunteers." Carried out in cooperation with State and Federal employment services, it was focused at first on seasonal employment in agriculture and on the railroads.

Indians were given help in moving permanently away from the reservations. They were shipped off to large cities, particularly Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Help provided the Indian jobseekers and their family dependents included transportation to the relocation destination, subsistence grants prior to receipt of the first paycheck and guidance in community adjustment. These grants averaged \$1,700 for single Indians, \$3,500 for family groups.

In 1953, as a result of increased appropriations made available by Congress, the bureau increased both the geographic scope of the program and the range of services provided. Three years later, Congress gave the program additional impetus by authorizing the bureau to provide Indians, chiefly between the ages of 18 and 35, with vocational training, on-the-job training and apprenticeship training.

During the 1950's, the BIA was held largely to a custodial, recordkeeping function. Little was done about housing needs or human resource development on the reservations and previously existing bureau services (except for education) were severely curtailed.

Seeking relief from poverty and miserable living conditions on the reservations, Indians by the thousands ventured, or were pushed, into the white man's world. Here, many felt discriminated against and, in the slums to which their economic and social position consigned them, they were unable even to see the sky.

Homesickness set in. In their frustration, many heads of families took to drink and lost their jobs. Others decided it was better to live without comforts in a hovel, out of which a man could step into wide, open, sunny places where, at least, congenial companionship could be found.

Forty percent of the tribesmen drifted back to the reservations, some after having been resettled two and three times.

Toward the end of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Interior Roger Ernst decided that the experiment had failed. It had become evident that, under the resettlement policy, the more skilled and enterprising people moved away and the less enterprising stayed on, or came back to, the reservation. The effect was to distill off the most competent people, generation after generation. With the support of Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, Ernst called off the pressure for assimilation.

#### WORK, NOT WELFARE

Today, the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to improvement of the Indian in his natural habitat. Health and educational services have been stepped up, decent housing is beginning to be provided and vocational training is being expanded.

"There is very little wrong in the Indian picture," said Indian Commissioner Philo Nash, "that jobs won't fix. The Indian people want work, not welfare. Our goal is to train the Indian workers and get them connected with opportunities, wherever they may be. It means teaching the Indians, on and off the reservation, a trade or a vocation for which there is a real demand in the job market."

In short, the white man's world, with some of its comforts and opportunities, is being taken to the reservations.

Last month, in order to observe the effects of the shift of emphasis, I spent 4 days and nights on the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. During that period, it was slowly thawing out after a spell of 40-below-zero temperatures. This

winter, I was told, has been colder than most. But at Pine Ridge, all winters are cruel.

#### SITE OF LAST MASSACRE

The Pine Ridge Reservation—about 40 miles wide and 100 miles long—was chosen because it is one of the largest in both acreage and population. Here, members of the Oglala Sioux Tribe have lived in peace—and most of them in extreme poverty—since buffalo hunters killed off the herds and the U.S. Army crushed the Indian warriors.

The massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890, the last engagement in which U.S. soldiers killed Indians, took place on Pine Ridge. It is a living and bitter memory to men who are still walking and talking today.

The population of the reservation is now about 1,900 families—(8,303 people at the last count). Two-thirds or more live in shacks, tepees and canvas tents that are dirty, draughty, and overcrowded. A 1961 survey by the Public Housing Administration showed 98 percent of all the habitations to be substandard. Two-thirds of the heads of families are unemployed.

But on Pine Ridge I saw also a glimmer of hope in 51 modern residences nearing completion. For the first time, public housing is being made available to Indians living on a reservation.

For these new dwellings, the Indians owe thanks in large measure to attorney Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux and three other tribes in Washington. In 1961, Schifter persuaded the Public Housing Administration, which since its inception had done its work in larger centers of the country, that it had the legal authority to help Indian reservations as well.

With money borrowed from the Federal Government, the newly created, tribally controlled Oglala Sioux Housing Authority proceeded to clear land, lay out streets, and construct homes.

#### CHARACTER A QUALIFICATION

Twenty-four of the houses have 4 bedrooms, 22 have 3 bedrooms each, 3 have 2 bedrooms, and 2 have only 1. The homes were built on 60- by 100-foot lots at an average cost of \$8,000. These are said to be equal in value to privately constructed off-reservation homes costing from \$11,000 to \$12,000.

The dwellings are being rented by the OSHA on the basis of need and character, particularly sobriety. Preference is given to displaced or homeless families, war veterans and the disabled or handicapped.

A few have been assigned to families on permanent relief. Rent, which includes electricity, water, propane gas, and maintenance, ranges from \$28 to \$58 a month, depending on ability to pay.

With the exception of the sheet metal work, Indians performed all the labor. Of 135 who initially applied for work, only 2 could be classified as journeymen carpenters. Most had no tools at all; some had only hammer and saw. None had any experience in laying cement blocks.

Under the tutelage of the two carpenters and Federal Housing Inspector Charles Heintzelman, the novices learned as they worked. A lone plumber and a lone electrician likewise taught their trades to others.

Heintzelman soon discovered that it was costing 50 cents each to lay foundation blocks. He told the Indians they would have to do much better or non-Indians would be brought in.

"This work is for Indians only," he was reminded. "Only for Indians who work," Heintzelman countered.

The effect of the warning was good. Soon the cost of laying blocks dropped to 17 cents each. Reviewing his work at the end of the year, Heintzelman said: "Indians can do good work, skillfully, with their hands after a little training. Never before in my experi-

ence have I seen such a change in a group of men."

Now all the Indian construction workers own their tools. Soon they are to begin work on 76 similar homes on the reservation.

#### OWN INTERIOR DECORATORS

Emil Redwing, with his wife and children, moved into the first completed house. Emil had taken the carpenter trainee course. Into the second went a widow, Athella Yellow Boy, and her five children. Another was assigned to Margaret Fills Pipe, a widow with four young ones. Ten houses now have tenants, another 10 are scheduled to be occupied by April.

Few of the families to whom houses were assigned had any belongings to speak of. So the tribal council appropriated \$500 to buy old and broken furniture and new upholstery supplies. In a workshop conducted by a State home demonstration agent, Bessie T. Cornelius, Indian men and women repaired and refinished their own second-hand beds, tables, lamps, and chairs.

Housewives about to become housewives were shown how to take care of floors and walls, bathrooms and electric refrigerators, and how to operate washing machines. In sewing classes, the women learned to make their own curtains, draperies, and slipcovers.

Classes were conducted in time management (the Sioux language contains no word meaning "time"); the women were shown the advantages of budgeting their hours and days. Instruction was given in family and neighbor relations, first aid and personal hygiene, and in the preparation of balanced, nutritious meals.

#### HOUSEPROUD TENANTS

There is some skepticism about how these houses will look after they have been lived in 6 months or so. The tenants I interviewed showed extreme pride in their new abodes; the homes I visited were sparsely furnished but immaculate.

Last October 28, a message to the Oglala Sioux from President Kennedy expressed his "fervent hope that these new homes, built by your own people, are the beginning of a better life for your community. As industry, commerce, and tourist trade develop, poverty and disease can be stamped out and the people of the Pine Ridge Reservation can at last enjoy a standard of living comparable to that of the country as a whole."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]  
FISHHOOK INDUSTRY GIVES SIOUX A LIFT  
(By Aubrey A. Graves)

What has been the effect of the Federal Government's decision to call off its emphasis on early termination of its trusteeship over the American Indians, and instead to start creating employment and improving living conditions on their reservations?

On the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, I found that more Indians are gainfully employed today than at any time since the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's.

Here, a simple, inexpensive item—a fishhook—has given the Oglala Sioux Tribe a substantial economic lift and many secondary benefits.

#### MINIMUM WAGE

Two hundred and twenty-four heads of families are now employed in three plants established by the Wright & McGill Co. of Denver. Bare fishhooks are sent to the reservation, where the Indians snell (tie leaders on) them. Then the finished product is shipped back to Denver.

Paid the minimum wage of \$1.15 an hour, the Indian workers draw \$46 a week. Many receive bonuses for overquota production. This adds up to a weekly payroll in excess of \$10,000 in an impoverished community where 1,300 of the 1,900 heads of families are still unemployed.



These incomes have enabled some of the workers to move their families out of canvas tents and log shacks into some of the 51 modern dwellings being built at Pine Ridge with Federal funds.

Seventy-six similar homes are to be started soon at Wounded Knee and Kyle, within walking distance of the Wright & McGill plants at those two centers.

The tribesmen have developed high skill at this work. The men tie from 80 to 100 dozen hooks a day, the women average about 60 dozen.

"Nothing has happened since tribal days to so boost the economic situation and morale of the Sioux," declared Leslie Towle, superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Pine Ridge.

#### ENTER TRAINING

Seven hundred and thirty-one Indians entered training for the jobs; 439 successfully completed the course. As of May, 1962, 388 were working. Excess inventories at the Denver factory have since caused 164 to be laid off. The training program cost the BIA \$66,000. The apprentices were paid 57½ cents an hour, out of BIA funds, during the learning period.

The Indians have taken great pride in their success. "It used to be a great honor when one of our fellows came home with a buffalo," said Emil Redfish, manager of the three plants. "Songs were sung for him, there was dancing, and powwows were given in his honor. Strangely, these celebrations are coming back with this industry."

#### PRIDE WONDERFUL

Redfish said the Denver office was bewildered when the payroll was sent in containing such names as Many Cartridges, George Respects Nothing, Return From Scout and Afraid of Hawk. "A Wright & McGill lady telephoned," he recalled with a chuckle, "and asked if these were the real names that were supposed to go on the paychecks."

It is wonderful, Redfish said, to see the pride displayed by his people when they come out of the plant on Friday with that check in hand. "One man told me it was the first time he was able to walk into a store, pick out what he wanted and pay for it."

Redfish said that about one-third of the employees are women. He explained that "we have a lot of women who need jobs who have families. Mrs. McGill, the head of the company, insists on women having equal opportunity. Believe me, when the boss says put this many women on, you don't answer her back."

In one respect, the women proved superior to the men. "We have 44 machines in use," explained Redfish. "We had men on these machines and they handled them like they would a truck. They were banging them around and it was costing a little money to keep them in repair every month, so we switched over to women and we haven't had one cent of repair expense since."

#### AREA DIRECTOR

All workers must punch a timeclock. When one is late, he is docked. When he is absent from work more than once and doesn't call in or have a valid excuse when he comes back, he is fired. "The Wright & McGill Indians," said Redfish, "now understand what time is."

The area director for BIA in Aberdeen, S. Dak., Martin Holm, made a survey of benefits resulting from the existence of the plants. They had resulted, he reported, in increased school attendance. The children are better dressed and better fed. Study habits and classroom work have improved.

"When parents get up in the morning to go to work," he wrote, "they naturally send the children to school more regularly. And, because their parents work near home, they no longer drag their children out of school to the potato fields at harvest time."

Because of the new employment, general assistance payments dropped at Pine Ridge from \$53,864 during 3 winter months of 1961 to \$41,226 during the same 3 months in 1962, when the plants were operating. The names of 74 families on relief rolls in 1961 were not on them in 1962.

One adverse effect has been noted. Because the Indians have more money to spend, drinking has increased in the locale of the plants, particularly among single male workers. "They are prone to dissipate their checks for alcoholic beverages," the report said. "The married workers tend to use their checks for self and family improvement."

#### MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON HELPS TO DRAMATIZE FEDERAL AID TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginians will not soon forget the March 1, 1963, visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to the cities of St. Albans and Charleston, W. Va. The Vice President's wife, braving a heavy rain, cheerfully participated in groundbreaking ceremonies for a new library, the construction of which is made possible by an accelerated public works program grant of \$69,000.

On that same day, and with none of her good spirits diminished, Mrs. Johnson toured the Food Machinery Corp. plant in Charleston, W. Va., presenting diplomas to previously unemployed workers who were retrained, under the area redevelopment administration program, for the good jobs they now hold with FMC.

To West Virginians who saw her in action on that memorable day, Mrs. Johnson was a lovely, gracious, and spirited symbol of the continuing high interest which President Kennedy's administration holds for the people of the Mountain State. None of us who accompanied her will ever forget the affection which she engendered and the encouragement she imparted to the many people she met and to those who turned out to hear her inspiring words.

The story of Mrs. Johnson's visit to West Virginia is excellently related in the Wednesday, March 6, 1963, edition of the Christian Science Monitor by Staff Correspondent Josephine Ripley. If anything, Miss Ripley's account stirs one with appreciation for the Vice President's wife, and for the many thoughtful ways in which she is serving the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Ripley's article printed at this point in the RECORD so that Mrs. Johnson's fine efforts on this occasion in West Virginia can be universally read and admired.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES LENDS HELP IN WEST VIRGINIA

(By Josephine Ripley)

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—The visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, wife of the Vice President, to West Virginia in the beating rain dramatized the helping hand which the Federal Government is extending to this mountainous State with its long unemployment lines.

While a local official held a huge umbrella over her head, Mrs. Johnson participated in

the groundbreaking ceremonies on March 1 for a new library in St. Albans, turning over a ladylike spade full of mud.

But the scene was by no means dreary. A crowd had turned out for the occasion. It was a big day in St. Albans, if not a bright one.

#### BOOKS PRESENTED

Massed umbrellas roofed the small stand where speakers one by one, including Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, stepped to the microphone, and Mrs. Johnson presented the new library with a dozen or more books autographed by the President, the Vice President and others.

There was a pause after announcement of each book as someone groped for it under the cover placed over the carton to protect the volumes from the rain.

But despite the dripping umbrellas, the muddy site of the new library, and the damp costumes of the majorettes whose act was canceled by the weather, the occasion was not a dismal one.

On the contrary, the ground breaking represented a \$69,000 public works grant by the Federal Government. It heralded a construction project which will give jobs to nearly a hundred townspeople. It will mean a real library in St. Albans for the first time—a civic project toward which the town has worked for the past 7 years.

Officials regard it as symbolic of some \$15 million worth of public works projects in West Virginia designed to spur employment. These are projects toward which the State contributes half the necessary amount with the Federal Government making up the rest.

Mrs. Johnson's next official stop in her 1-day trip to Charleston was at the FMC plant where another form of aid, under the Area Redevelopment Administration is being extended to the State.

#### RETRAINING CEREMONY

The huge, cavernous factory clattered, clanged, and spat blinding flame as acetylene torches bit into steel. At the end of the assembly line stood a lumbering, tractor-like vehicle known as a personnel carrier.

These carriers are being manufactured under a defense contract for the transportation of military troops.

Mrs. Johnson's task, surprisingly, was to preside here in the factory at a kind of graduation ceremony for retrainees to whom she presented diplomas.

These were former miners, construction workers, and laborers of various kinds—all unemployed—who had taken the ARA retraining course to become machinists, welders, metalworkers of various kinds, and qualify for work in the FMC plant.

The men who put down their tools to step up and receive the diploma inscribed with their name and their newly acquired skill studied it closely—and liked what they saw.

#### FORMER MINERWORKER

A former mineworker who had earned no more than \$5 a day, and sometimes as little as 40 cents a day, at his old job, is now making \$2.08 an hour with a 40-hour week. Others told of similar wage improvement.

West Virginia's unemployed now total 66,800. Retraining of miners for whom there is now no mining and for others whose jobs have been eliminated by changing times is a slow process.

The FMC plant employs 230 retrained workers today, with the number expected to increase to 1,000 eventually as the program turns out more qualified "graduates."

In the State as a whole, more than 2,000 men have been retrained for new employment.

The FMC itself, whose home plant is in California, opened its West Virginia branch under the ARA which encourages plants with defense contracts to locate in States

with heavy unemployment, if conditions warranted such a move.

The company here moved into an abandoned ordnance plant built in World War I. West Virginia has received \$4,300,000 in aid under the ARA program over the past year.

"Much has been done," as Mrs. Johnson put it when she presented diplomas to the FMC retrainees, "much more needs to be done. The problems in the depressed areas of the country didn't spring up overnight, and they will not be cured overnight. But we have started."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENT OF HON. OREN E. LONG TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of personal pleasure that I noted the appointment a few days ago of my longtime friend and former colleague, Oren E. Long, as senior U.S. member of the South Pacific Commission.

His appointment recognizes Oren Long's special knowledge, background, and longtime interest in the important problems of the Pacific Basin. He has expressed his pleasure in accepting this appointment, since it would enable him to continue his residence in his beloved Hawaii. Nevertheless I am sure his legion of friends realize his qualifications merit even greater honors.

Six months ago, near the close of the 87th Congress, I delivered a farewell tribute on the Senate floor to Oren Long, who had announced earlier his decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. Oren and I worked closely on numerous problems involving the new State of Hawaii—problems that faced the 50th State as it shed its territorial status and assumed new and heavier responsibilities of statehood. We attained a fine working relationship—a relationship which I am happy to say is being

continued on the same high plane and mutual cooperation by Oren Long's successor, my friend and distinguished colleague, DAN INOUE.

I fervently hope that the President's appointment of Oren Long will be the forerunner of more appointments to come for others in Hawaii who, like Oren, have given so much to their State and country. I regret to say that the 50th State has been conspicuously overlooked in the matter of major appointments in the national administration. We have among our population outstanding men and women who have demonstrated their talents and capabilities in government, the professions, business, agriculture, and industry. As the Pacific crossroads, Hawaii has developed a reservoir of educated and specialized persons who are particularly knowledgeable about the Orient and the Occident, the East and the West.

We are disappointed that Hawaii has been bypassed by the White House, especially when we note that our island friends in Puerto Rico and Guam have received recognition in appointments to high posts in the U.S. Government. We salute such appointees from Puerto Rico as Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Chief of the Alliance for Progress; and from Guam, Mr. Richard F. Taitano, Director of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

There are men and women in Hawaii, talented, dedicated, and skillful in special fields, who are ready and eager to serve. They ask not what America will do for them but rather what they can do for their country. I say to President Kennedy: Give these islanders the opportunity to work for their country. They will more than prove their merit, especially in problems involving Asia and the Pacific basin.

#### DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unable to be present in the Senate today. He has been called away from Washington by reason of his duties as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and he is in Annapolis at the present time.

He had prepared a statement for the RECORD dealing with the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, that the full text of the remarks which he had prepared be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR CASE, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963, ON SENATE FLOOR ON DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO THE TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.

There are three recent developments which encourage me to reintroduce a bill to author-

ize the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

First, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has written me of the "effective presentation" made by Author Pearl Buck, chairman of the training school's board of directors, and another official of the Vineland institution for retarded children at hearings conducted late last year by the Muskie subcommittee. I recognize fully that this letter does not constitute a commitment for the bill, but it does point up the decided advantages of the Vineland program.

Second, President Kennedy has focused on the enormous effort that needs to be made if mental retardation is to be effectively prevented and controlled. On February 5, the President sent a special message to Congress dealing with mental illness and mental retardation in which he recommended an impressive expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion of facilities throughout the Nation. The President's program emphasizes the need for diagnostic and other facilities of the very type proposed by the Vineland school, which is an internationally recognized private institution, willing to pay the Government for the privilege of taking the idle island off its hands.

Third, I have been joined in sponsoring the bill by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, who is deeply interested in the problems which the Vineland Training School seeks to meet.

The full text of the letter written by Chairman MUSKIE is as follows:

MARCH 1, 1963.

DEAR CLIFF: I have your good letter of March 1, advising of your tentative plans to reintroduce legislation similar to S. 2852 of the 87th Congress, which authorized the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

As of this moment, the subcommittee is awaiting the printing of the record of the hearings held last year on the disposition of Ellis Island. I anticipate that these hearings should be printed within the next 2 weeks, and I hope that in the very near future we can move to further consideration of this matter.

You will be pleased to know that Miss Buck and Dr. Jacob made a very effective presentation at our New York City hearings in behalf of the proposed disposal of the island to the training school at Vineland, N.J. Certainly, the Vineland plan is one of the best developed proposals which has been presented to the subcommittee and it has the added advantage of emanating from a long-established institution which enjoys an outstanding reputation in the field of mental retardation.

I assume that the subcommittee will decide to give further study and consideration to the matter of the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. If that is the case, I am confident that the plan presented by the training school at Vineland will be carefully examined.

Hoping that we may look forward to further counsel and advice from you on this very complicated question, and with warmest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,  
U.S. Senate, Chairman.

In his special message, President Kennedy emphasized the magnitude of the problem of mental retardation when he noted:

"The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have—as in the case of mental illness—been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as



muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

"States and local communities spend \$300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another \$250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate \$37 million for research, training and special services for the retarded and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

"Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all—and most severely—in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income."

There is every reason to believe, as the President does, that we are on the threshold of important advances in this field. Fifteen to twenty-five percent of the cases of mental retardation can now be identified as to cause. But many specific causes are still unknown. Preventive steps are wholly inadequate. Lack of prenatal care can be tied directly to resultant cases of mental retardation. Community services are not sufficient to the task. Frequently, they are outmoded in concept.

New institutional services are needed. Public understanding of the problem must be improved. Diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal aid services need to be strengthened. We need to improve our research facilities. There is a need to expand special education, training and rehabilitation services. Due to a lack of trained teachers, supervisors and the rest, only about one-fourth of the Nation's 1,250,000 retarded children of school age have access to the special education they require.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of this white elephant. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100 percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education or welfare or a combination thereof. After reviewing the applications submitted at that time, the Department rejected them all and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of the last Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate, each directing the head of the General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to a particular organization for a particular purpose. My own bill was S. 2852.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that GSA is looking to Congress to make the policy decision both as to the purpose to which Ellis Island shall be devoted in the future and as to which organization should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a non-profit corporation of the State of New Jersey and has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. Diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and also a school for the training of teachers in this field. This has led to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. The result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors from all over the world to study these techniques and methods in action.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill we have introduced would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the administration of the General Services Administration, less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been advancing the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period, arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Freedom from the handicaps of mental retardation is still another freedom to which historic Ellis Island can yet be the gateway.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MUST THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FAIL?—THE ACID TEST IS AT HAND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress was one of the great, constructive, imaginative proposals of President Kennedy. It proposed, through U.S. financial aid, plus U.S. know-how, expertise, and cooperation, to help the Latin American countries move into the mid-20th century. It proposed, by means of a cooperative understanding, based on a willingness on the part of the Latin American governments, to establish long overdue reforms—taxation, anti-inflation measures, cessation of usurious lending practices, land distribu-

tion, a willingness to increase the efficiency and integrity of government operation to prevent aid funds from being wasted or misappropriated—and thereby to achieve, by evolutionary means, a peaceful economic and social revolution. Such a peaceful revolution is essential if a violent, bloody revolution is to be obviated.

The fact is that many of the countries of Latin America are ripe for revolution. At the top of an antiquated feudal structure is entrenched a power elite who control both government and the financial and economic resources of the nation. Theirs is the power monopoly that maintains the archaic political, economic, and social structure which makes the majority of Latin American countries a fertile ground for revolution by the exploited, ill nourished, ill housed, virtually destitute and hopeless vast majority.

Such countries—in the absence of the needed reform and in the failure by those on top to provide it—should have revolutions. Unfortunately, any revolution today is promptly infiltrated by international communism—as in Cuba—directed by Moscow or Peking and diverted from its legitimate goals.

Mexico furnishes an illustration in point. Its long overdue, needed revolution began in 1910 and was concluded at the end of the century's second decade. It was both a political and social revolution. It abolished usurped continuity in the presidential office, such as that of Porfirio Diaz, who had overthrown existing constitutional provisions and kept himself—a dictator—in the presidency for a generation, by providing one 6-year term for the president and no reelection. It provided for the breakup of the vast latifundios, or land estates, and the distribution of the land to the peasantry. The ideology and motivations of the Mexican revolutionaries—Madero, Zapata, Carranza, Obregon, Calles, and their associates—were wholly indigenous. They were drawn out of Mexico's own experience and responded to Mexico's needs. There was no foreign infiltration, either ideologically or materially.

But we may be certain that had the Mexican revolution taken place a quarter of a century or more later, it would have been invaded by Kremlin agents, who would have attempted to take it over and to spread their subversion throughout Latin America.

The sad fact, however, is that the noble concept of the *Alianza para el Progreso* is about to fail, because those in power in Latin America have not, in the great majority of cases, initiated or carried through the needed reforms. It was perhaps a bit naive to expect those entrenched in power—politically, economically, and socially—to yield in any substantial degree their vested prerogatives, their palaces, their landed estates, their "conspicuous consumption", to borrow a phrase from Thorstein Veblen, in order that the people on whose backs and shoulders their affluence rested might be lifted from their abject misery. Nevertheless, that was the hope, and President Kennedy's prescription of such action on the part of the Latin

American power elite was supposedly a *sine qua non* of the Alliance.

A large part of the fault, however, is ours. The administration itself has been inveigled into giving without receiving its stipulated *quid pro quo*. It has continued to pour our dollars into unstable and uncooperative regimes, to buttress their follies, to give them budgetary support, to finance their deficits. By doing this it has not merely wasted our substance, but actually, by supporting the feudal edifice, given encouragement and comfort to the very subversive forces which seek to overthrow the existing regimes and enthrone Communist-dominated leadership in their place.

The time has passed when lipservice from these power elites should suffice to turn on the numerous spigots—variously, grants, development loans, and other so-called loans or credits, or refunding operations.

The issue is pertinently and crucially posed by the presence in Washington of a high-powered financial delegation from Brazil which seeks to persuade President Kennedy that just once more the pitcher should go to the well of American financial assistance and rescue the Government of Brazil from its past extravagances and follies.

It will be argued—as it has been argued before—that this time it is different. It will be eloquently pleaded that President Goulart has a new mandate to establish an austerity regime; that he has already taken and proposes to take such-and-such steps.

On the basis of such or similar previous promises, the United States has poured over \$2 billion into Brazil. What is there to show for it?

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, it is imperative that for once our Government stand firm and wait at least 6 months or a year to see how these promises are carried out and whether the Goulart government is capable of seeing them through into the realm of tangible results.

If again we weaken—as we did in the case of Peru after our 1 week's firm stand against the military takeover—and as we have repeatedly "refunded" Brazil's financial chaos, our Government itself can take to itself a large share of the blame for the collapse of the Alliance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various articles bearing on this subject be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. They are: An article from the Washington Post of March 10, entitled "Dantas Due Here for Talks Vital to United States-Brazilian Ties"; an article from this morning's Washington Post, by its distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, entitled "Brazil's Choice: Reform or Ruin"; an article from the Miami Herald entitled "Alliance Makes Little Headway in Four Key Latin Countries."

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the last article mentioned does not deal with Brazil. It deals with four other countries—smaller countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru—where, cer-

tainly in the case of the first two, the efforts of their governments to meet President Kennedy's prescriptions have been valiantly attempted. Even there the difficulties and problems are great. But if in the case of Brazil we now again become soft and an easy touch before the evidence of compliant action by the Brazilian Government is crystal clear and demonstrable after adequate trial, we shall be making the task of successful implementation of the Alliance in other countries even more difficult, if not virtually impossible.

Our action now in the case of Brazil—and for the sake of Brazil—will constitute, in my judgment, at least, the acid test of whether the *Alianza Para El Progreso* can be made to succeed.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

#### DANTAS DUE HERE FOR TALKS VITAL TO UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN TIES

(By Dan Kurzman)

Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco Clementino de San Tiago Dantas will arrive here this evening on a mission that could determine the future pattern of American-Brazilian relations.

Ties between the two Nations have been strained in recent months owing to U.S. dissatisfaction with Brazil's efforts to stabilize its inflation-ridden economy and contain extreme leftist activities.

This friction was underscored when Attorney General Robert Kennedy made a hurried trip to Brazil earlier this year. Kennedy let President Joao Goulart know that Washington's inclination to aid Brazil under the Alliance for Progress will hinge on Brazil's willingness to help itself.

Since the Kennedy mission, the Brazilian Government has shown signs of embarking on a serious endeavor to strengthen its economy and its resistance to far leftist infiltration. And the visit of Finance Minister Dantas reflects American satisfaction with this progress.

In Dantas, the most powerful man in the Brazilian Cabinet, the United States will be dealing with a man who does not always see eye to eye with Washington's hemisphere policy.

#### FAVORS CUBA NEGOTIATIONS

He has often said that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba instead of isolating it. As Foreign Minister in an earlier Goulart government, he opposed the ouster of Cuba from the Organization of American States (OAS) in early 1962. He also pushed for the renewal of Brazilian diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1961.

In his new role of Finance Minister, Dantas, who will meet with President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and other U.S. officials, is not expected to discuss Cuba on a formal basis. But the subject may come up informally in the course of the conversations.

With the United States edging toward a coexistence policy regarding Cuba, the views of Brazil and this country are probably closer than they had been in the past. The United States, however, may suggest that the Brazilian Government tighten up its efforts to control Castroite subversion in Brazil, particularly travel to and from Cuba by agents and trainees.

The main purpose of Dantas' visit, however, is to solicit American assistance in stabilizing Brazil's finances and implementing development projects under a newly blueprinted 3-year plan.

#### SEEKS DEBT REVISION

Dantas will ask the United States to reschedule repayment of debts falling due in 1963, 1964, and 1965 over a period of about 20 years. Of Brazil's total world debt of \$2.8 billion, \$1.5 billion must be repaid with interest in the next 3 years.

About two-thirds of this \$1.5 billion is owed the United States, the remainder to European countries and several international financial organizations, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Dantas will ask the other creditors as well as the United States for rescheduling of debt payments.

The foreign exchange liberated by agreement of the creditors to this request, Dantas will argue, could be used to finance development projects.

U.S. officials indicate they may consider such a request for rescheduling, but that in most cases refinancing would be more feasible. That is, Brazil would be required to pay off its debt on time and then would be offered new credits.

Such credits may come from a release of part of the \$338 million committed to Brazil in 1961. Eighty-four million dollars of this has been held up because of Brazil's apparent lack of effort until recently to take effective anti-inflationary and other economic measures.

The changing U.S. attitude toward Brazil can be attributed to a number of measures taken since full presidential powers were restored to Goulart following a plebiscite in early January.

Goulart, because of his leftist tendencies, had been denied these powers by Congress when he took over the government following the dramatic resignation of President Janio Quadros in 1961. Brazil's Armed Forces had pressed for such limitations.

Having regained these powers with the help of the far left, Goulart has increasingly dissociated himself from the extremists. These groups now are accusing the President and Dantas of conservatism.

Economically, the government has, despite the political dangers, adopted an anti-inflationary program calling for a 35 percent slash in government spending.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

#### BRAZIL'S CHOICE: REFORM OR RUIN

(By Marquis Childs)

The Government in Brazil got hold of some secret documents the other day that illustrate the depth of the split between the hard-line Chinese Communists and the followers of the Khrushchev line of coexistence. Throughout Latin America the split is developing into more or less open conflict.

The seized documents reveal a quarrel between hard-line leaders over funds believed sent from Havana for carrying out propaganda and subversion in Brazil's poverty-ridden northeast. The accusation was that somewhere along the way sticky fingers held back part of the money. As word of the documents got around, an emissary of the Moscow coexistence faction approached the Government with a request for copies—they would be useful in blasting the enemy.

Cuba, as seen from Brazil, has quite a different look than the perspective from Washington. The blacks and the whites are not nearly so well defined. President Joao Goulart has told recent visitors of his concern that the United States by directly attacking Cuba might bring the quarreling factions together and thereby put an end to the greatest hope since 1917 of permanently dividing the world Communist movement.

To see ourselves as others see us—or, more important, in the current struggle to see the world as it looks to others—is a difficult task as we become increasingly preoccupied with our own immediate troubles. This applies



to all of Latin America and particularly to Brazil, which has just sent an important mission to Washington headed by Minister of Finance Francisco San Tiago Dantas.

As India is the key to the future in Asia, so Brazil is the test for Latin America. What Guatemala or Nicaragua have to say may serve the purposes of American foreign policy. But what Brazil says—and does—is likely to be decisive. And so critical is Brazil's raging inflation that perhaps no more than 2 to 2½ years of choice remain.

This is not to suggest any real parallel between the economies of the two nations. São Paulo has industry as advanced as anywhere in the world, and Rio de Janeiro is a modern capital in every sense of the word.

But the desperate poverty in Brazil's northeast, where in some areas per capita income is no more than \$50, bears a close resemblance to the problem of India with its average per capita income of \$69.

In presenting his case for rescheduling \$89 million of loans and for further economic assistance to American and international loan and monetary agencies, Dantas is pointing to stern measures to curb inflation. These include a major tax reform, a cut in the Federal budget of 35 percent, eliminating subsidies on imported wheat and fuel and an effort to put some sense into the chaotic government-owned transport and communication system with a raise in rates.

Stringent efforts are being made to check the flight of capital. Since the plebiscite in January ending the political crisis and giving Goulart authority, Brazil's currency has strengthened.

Dantas claims wide support from the non-Communist left for the anti-inflationary program, with workers realizing that a 52-percent inflation, as in 1962, robs the rich more than the poor. At the same time he is pushing the 3-year development program, with two-thirds of new investment to come from the private sector.

In Brazil, as in most of Latin America, there is a growing skepticism over the Alliance for Progress. On a TV program in Rio the other day a speaker said:

"The Alliance for Progress is dead, however much I should hope for its resurrection. The main reason for its failure seems to be the following: It was necessary to establish close coordination between help from the Alliance and basic reforms.

"But unfortunately the rich in Latin America talk too much about reform and label as Communists all those who would enforce it. This is easy to understand: The rich in Latin America go on holding 80 percent of the land on the continent. Often they control parliament and have the intensity of their idealism and hope in the future gaged by the bank deposits kept in their names in the United States and in Europe."

These words were spoken not by a radical leftist but by Dom Helder Camara, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Rio. They underscore how very late the hour is. In Brazil, with its furious economic and political currents, time is rapidly running out.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

#### ALLIANCE MAKES LITTLE HEADWAY IN FOUR KEY LATIN COUNTRIES

(By Dom Bonafede)

LIMA, PERU.—After almost 2 years, the Alliance for Progress has hardly made a ripple in four strategic countries in Latin America.

An on-the-scene assessment of the program in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru indicates that little, if any, headway has been made toward the original concept of the Alliance—to promote social and economic reforms for the betterment of the Latin masses within a decade.

For the most part the humanitarian objectives of the program have been amended. Instead of working at the bottom of the social structure, Alliance funds and manpower are concentrated in the rarified atmosphere of higher economics, apparently on the theory that political stability and industrial growth must precede help for the common man.

Large doses of money are being poured into these countries to prop up the national economy, balance budgets (including those top-heavy with military expenditures), and improve balance-of-payments deficits.

"In order to pay for the social improvements envisaged under the Alliance there must be a significant increase in economic production," reported an official of the Agency for International Development (AID) in Quito, Ecuador.

#### CAMPESINO MUST WAIT

Meanwhile, the illiterate, barefoot campesino with the tubercular wife and famished children is waiting for help to filter down to him.

In many cases claims made by AID officials are distorted since the amount of money earmarked for a country and the actual funds disbursed vary greatly, the latter being considerably less.

Here is a summary of how each of the four countries are faring under the Alliance:

Venezuela: In 1961 the country was scheduled to receive \$115 million. Of this \$80 million from the Export Bank was mainly used for bolstering the balance-of-payments structure, \$3 million went for housing. Last year \$92 million was available on paper but only \$6.5 million has been put into use—\$5 million for aqueducts and \$1.5 million for rural housing.

Colombia: This is the country which AID portrays as the showcase for the Alliance in South America. But Alliance funds have been used in most part to plug the economic gap caused by falling coffee prices. An agrarian reform program is bogged down in politics, lack of trained administrators, and peasant disinterest.

Banditry and violence in the rich coffee-growing regions have frightened many campesinos into leaving their small farms. Lower income workers complain that there is too much red tape involved in getting into the new housing projects near Bogotá, including the one visited by President Kennedy during his trip there. Yet, the Alliance appears to have the best chance of succeeding here, if only because of the all-out effort.

Ecuador: Of \$64.5 million made available, less than a third has actually been disbursed. Despite the pitiful plight of Indian sharecroppers an agrarian reform program has not yet come out of the planning stage. AID officials say that a few hospitals and schools have been built under the Alliance but no houses. A recently approved loan has been granted to open up the dark jungle interior. And a loan application of \$4 million is pending for the construction of 2,000 classrooms and 700 teacher lodgings.

Peru: Suspension of United States-Peruvian relations in July 1962 interrupted the AID program. With the lifting of the suspension aid has been resumed but is only beginning to trickle in. Palace spokesmen maintain that Jorge Grieve, Peruvian member of the "nine wise men" who pass on Alliance economic proposals, is opposed to the ruling junta and is blocking credit for the country.

"We would rather deal with North Americans than Latins," declared Julio Vargas Prado, secretary to the military government.

Plans have been drafted to develop the Communist-infiltrated Convencion Valley. The Peace Corps, which feeds 182,000 Peruvian children through a school lunch program, is making a favorable impression.

#### OFFICIALS PLEAD FOR TIME

In each country AID officials plead for time. However, the high birth rates of these countries, the flight of foreign capital and the drop in basic commodity prices means that injections of money cannot keep pace with the vast needs of the people.

In Venezuela, which boasts a 3.6 percent annual population explosion—the highest in Latin America—President Romulo Betancourt has resettled some 53,000 families under an agrarian reform program, started incidentally prior to the launching of the Alliance. But the country's housing shortage is estimated at more than 700,000 units with an annual demand of about 60,000 units.

Declared an AID executive in Caracas: "There is no organized resistance here. But a feeling of urgency does not permeate all levels of government, especially at the lower levels. We're ready to go whenever they are."

While visiting the new housing projects it was found that some of the tenants had refrigerators and gas stoves but no electricity or gas to operate them.

Disenchantment with the Alliance has led to Latins blaming the United States and AID officials blaming the Latins.

In Peru, international politics is said to take precedence over the need for help.

"We have received practically no money under the Alliance for social development since the junta took over last year," reported Vargas Prado.

The Kennedy administration is known to be cool towards the junta government. The relationship between the two governments points up the unresolved problem whether aid should be dispensed along humanitarian lines unaffected by political bias.

Many Latins complain that the Alliance is not revolutionary enough. Yet when innovations are introduced with which they are unacquainted, such as savings and loan associations, they are slow in accepting them.

#### THE U.S. QUARANTINE OF CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are all aware of the forthright action taken by President Kennedy last October to force the removal of Russian missiles and bombers from Cuba. I think we all agree that the President acted properly, in view of the fact that the national security of the United States as well as that of the entire free world was at stake. What the President did was necessary, even though at the time there was probably no chance to make a careful study of its legality.

A scholarly article has recently been written, however, which demonstrates that the U.S. quarantine of Cuba violated neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the established rules of international law. This article, written by a member of the New York Bar, appeared in the February edition of the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

(NOTE.—In this article, Mr. Seligman examines the legal position of the action of the United States in imposing a quarantine on shipments to Castro at the height of the Cuban crisis. His analysis indicates that

the U.S. action was consistent both with the U.N. Charter and with established principles of international law.)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

#### ARTICLE 2 (4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). This article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151: "This, in effect, was the construction which the U.K. agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that Operation Retail, the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to article 2(4). He said: 'But our action on the 12th and 13th of November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence.'"

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152: "Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force, (a) against the territorial integrity of Cuba; or (b) against the political independence of Cuba; or (c) in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—of which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

#### SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to pro-

hibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is fully discussed in Bowett, op. cit., who concludes at page 186: "For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the charter raises a further question as to whether the charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if any armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191: "It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an 'armed attack occurs.' In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the charter has been described by Westlake, "International Law," second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows: "A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendant circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detective network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an ultimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey, or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the

threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939, that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The U.N. Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's "International Law," eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299: "The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every State to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But, unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The Charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (op. cit. p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine: "After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davoust, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled, Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote on the following page Lauterpacht states that: "The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is "justifiable in our opinion" is Westlake (op. cit. p. 315).

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been



able to adduce any evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the Charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the New York Times of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, Armed Forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advertised determination to spread its domination to the farthest corners of the earth.

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin.

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. Our history, as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people."

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furiously under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

#### THE ACTION OF THE OAS

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the OAS authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the Charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that "Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual State would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52 (1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Confer-

ence and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force "to prevent or repel aggression."

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the Charter.

#### MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about \$52 billion a year, or \$277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only \$15 billion, or \$53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these

countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yet, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching \$15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of \$314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States than in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends \$277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only \$53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

Something of an "agonizing reappraisal" of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated \$1 billion cost.

At the same time the United States is challenging all its European allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the allies in Europe.

And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. United States defense spending currently is at the rate of \$52 billion a year, or \$277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only \$15 billion, or \$53 per capita.

With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or

that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

This relationship must be, and it is being, reappraised.

As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover.

#### OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill—S. 20—is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be now considered, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also send to the desk an amendment which was very carefully studied by the committee and agreed to by the members of the subcommittee, which I ask the Senate to adopt at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 21, after the word "purposes" it is proposed to delete the semicolon, insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes—39 U.S.C. 4154—for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning the unanimous-consent agreement entered last week, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for making the request at this

time is that it is my understanding there will be no ye-a-and-nay vote on the measure now pending; that it is agreeable to all sides; and that the measure can be disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, those who may oppose S. 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, have done a very real service, whether it was intended or not. The bill will receive more careful study, and our recreation problems will become better understood as a result.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a 1-day conference on the bill on February 5, during the debate on the Senate rules, which claimed all the headlines. The committee subsequently decided to regard its February 5 proceedings as a hearing, and printed them as a hearing record.

The committee then considered the bill at its first executive session, adopted three minor amendments, and unanimously ordered the measure, as amended, reported to the Senate. Since that time, agreement has been reached to amend one of the committee amendments in regard to advance payments for research, which we have now done.

Bringing the measure to issue and debate affords us an opportunity to use the floor of the Senate to lay before the country a little more of the background and the dimensions of the outdoor recreation problem.

In the last two decades the United States has seen a phenomenal growth in use of outdoor recreation facilities.

Their use was growing some prior to World War II, but not so tremendously that it could not be handled by the addition of a new national park occasionally, or the development of a few picnic grounds and campgrounds in the national forests.

#### AN OPPORTUNITY MISSED

During the depression days in the thirties, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes foresaw the need for preservation of some areas to meet growing recreation demand. At his direction, the National Park Service made a survey of the shores of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico to determine if steps should be taken to reserve part of them for recreation.

The Park Service recommended that at least 10 percent of the 4,025 miles of oceans and gulf shore should be reserved. It consequently recommended that the Federal Government acquire 12 tracts of land, totaling 600,000 acres with 400 miles of water frontage, at an estimated cost of \$12 million. The tracts stretched all the way from Barnagat Inlet in New Jersey to Padre Island, Tex.

It is a very regrettable fact of history that the pressure for recreation facilities was not sufficient at that time to push the program through. The Nation could have acquired the 12 sites, with their 400 miles of frontage, for a very small fraction of what considerably less frontage is going to cost us today.



Only 1 of the 12 sites was acquired in the years just after the Ickes' survey—a part of Cape Hatteras off North Carolina. We are now in the process of buying a part of a second one—80 miles of the 117-mile Padre Island off Texas. It is going to cost us eight times the estimated cost of the whole 117 miles of Padre Island in 1935.

All of the other 10 sites recommended in the thirties have now been developed by private developers. A resurvey of them in 1955 showed that land values had multiplied many times in the two decades. One of the areas, Bogue Island off North Carolina, is a 30-mile island which could have been acquired in 1935 for \$260,000. In 1935 there was only 9 miles still undeveloped and its value was put at more than \$1 million—an increase of 1200 percent in valuation in two decades. The story at the other sites is the same. At one of them, which had been subdivided, values in 1955 were up from \$26 an acre to \$65 per front foot for a building lot.

#### WARTIME DECLINE

Part of the reason for our failure to act at that time was the approach of World War II, rising employment, and economic activity. When the war engulfed us, demand on recreation facilities plummeted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of visitors at National Park Service areas and at the national forests from 1941 through 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Visits to national park areas and national forests*

Year	Park Service areas <sup>1</sup>	National forests
1941.....	21,236,947	18,004,785
1942.....	9,370,969	10,407,120
1943.....	6,828,420	6,274,659
1944.....	8,339,775	7,151,953
1945.....	11,713,852	10,074,089
1946.....	21,752,315	18,240,677
1947.....	25,534,188	21,330,751
1948.....	29,858,828	24,010,964
1949.....	31,736,402	26,080,255
1950.....	33,252,589	27,367,797
1951.....	37,106,440	29,950,252
1952.....	42,209,836	33,006,885
1953.....	46,224,794	35,403,050
1954.....	47,833,913	40,304,037
1955.....	50,007,838	45,712,868
1956.....	54,923,000	52,556,084
1957.....	59,285,000	60,957,273
1958.....	58,677,000	68,449,500
1959.....	62,812,000	81,521,000
1960.....	72,288,000	92,594,500
1961.....	79,040,000	102,000,000
1962.....	88,000,000	112,762,000

<sup>1</sup> National park areas include parks, monuments, historical sites, and related areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this table tells only a part of the story of recreation demand in the United States. But it shows how demand declined during World War II, and then literally skyrocketed.

The national parks had 21 million visitors in 1941. That fell under 7 million in 1943, jumped back past 21 million in 1946, and has quadrupled since the immediate post-war period.

The Forest Service story is even more striking.

Visits to the national forests ran 18 million in 1941. They fell off to about 6 million in 1943, climbed to 10 million in 1945, and they were 10 times 10 million in 1961—102 million. The gain alone in 1962 is now estimated to be greater than the total attendance back in 1945.

#### GROWTH UNDERESTIMATED

We became aware of the tremendous growth in use of recreational facilities in the Nation in the fifties, when visitors and tourists started overflowing not only old facilities for recreationists, but all the new ones we could build. Our old pace of providing recreation areas and facilities wasn't keeping up with demand.

In 1954, Stephen Raushenbush of the Public Affairs Institute here in Washington went to a natural resources conference in Canada and told the participants that demand on recreational facilities was growing a great deal faster than population; that multipliers were at work. Raushenbush related rising per capita income and shorter working hours to the rising demand to explain why the increase was exceeding population growth. He made a very interesting attempt to startle the natural resources experts into a realization of the dimensions of the recreation problem they confronted by projecting demand ahead to 1960 on the basis, not just of population growth, but population growth times increased income and increased leisure. Raushenbush's projections were for a 32 percent to 50 percent increase in visits to park and forest recreation areas between 1953 and 1960. The actual increase was in the order of 110 percent. The U.S. parks and forests had 77.7 million visitors in 1953 and 164.9 million in 1960.

Raushenbush was not the only estimator in the fifties who was later shown to be overly conservative. Agencies across the country, in the recreation business, were awakening in this period to the situation which confronted them and planning to handle increased visitors, but they almost invariably set their sights too low. One factor they overlooked was the effect that post-war road building would have on recreation demand—the increased mobility of the increased numbers of people with higher incomes and more leisure time.

The 50 million visitors to National Park Service areas in 1955 were twice the capacity of facilities available to service them. Vacationists who were turned away from the crowded camping grounds and picnic areas grumbled, and they grumbled so loudly even those of us here in Washington could hear it. It came to us through the press and in our mail.

#### SCENIC AREAS ENDANGERED

The overload of park visitors was not only a public relations problem, it was resulting in damage to the natural and historic features of the park areas which the Park Service was supposed to protect and preserve. Campers who were unable to get into regular camping areas pitched their tents, built their fires, and left their garbage in the most scenic and interesting spots they could find. They were often right beside or even astride the finest attractions in the parks.

An inadequate force of park rangers was unable to police them all.

The National Park Service has a dual responsibility under its basic charter, the National Parks Act of 1916. One is to preserve and protect the great natural scenic areas entrusted to it for the undiminished enjoyment of future generations. The other is to provide reasonable access to the areas for the pleasure and recreation of the present generation.

The 50 million visitors to the parks were making it impossible for the Park Service to discharge its preservation responsibility, and so, in 1956, it submitted to Congress a 10-year \$600 million program to provide facilities to handle 80 million visitors. That was the number of visitors anticipated in 1966 under the project, known to all of us now as Mission 66.

If Senators will refer to the table I have placed in the RECORD, they will find that the number of visitors to the Park Service areas went beyond 80 million in 1962—4 years ahead of the predicted time schedule. It should have been Mission 62 instead of Mission 66.

#### THE FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE

The National Forest Service responded to the recreation pressure on its facilities in the midfifties with Operation Outdoors, developed in 1956 and initiated in 1957.

Operation Outdoors was less than a one-tenth part of the program for the national forests submitted to Congress in 1957. The total program for the forests was estimated to cost \$1.7 billion. Out of that total, \$123 million was for 102 new family camping units and similar recreational facilities.

In 1961, when demand had overrun the original estimates and after President John F. Kennedy had called for greater emphasis on natural resources conservation, mentioning the forests specifically, the Forest Service revised its program upward by 50 percent to a \$2.5 billion level. But it more than tripled the share of the recreational programs in the new allocation of funds. Instead of \$123 million for recreation, the revision contained \$409 millions for that purpose. To handle its more than 100 million annual visits, the Forest Service proposes the reconstruction and rehabilitation of 2,000 existing campgrounds; development of 28,000 new camping and picnic areas; development of 4,000 recreation sites where boating, swimming, winter sports, and other recreational uses can be served; and special developments at outstanding scenic and recreational areas which attract unusually large crowds.

Thus, the bold new programs of the fifties, proposed by both the Park Service and the Forest Service—Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors—proved overly conservative.

It should be said, in fairness, that program proposals which reach Congress are almost invariably more modest than the original agency proposals. There is a Budget Bureau between the agency and Congress, with an eye on the dollar and the budget balance, and too little contact with the realities of life out where people live. For example, the Bureau for

some years vetoed any appropriation request in behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service for recreation, although millions of visitors were pouring into the game ranges and refuges every year. The visitors had to be policed, the garbage picked up and essential recreation services performed by staff and facilities pirated from other budget items.

Unquestionably, the Park Service and the Forest Service originally sought more adequate programs than those which were finally proposed to the Congress.

By 1958 it had become apparent even to us in the Congress that we had a bear by the tail—almost literally. We were trying to handle a bigger problem than we had realized by a handle which was wholly inadequate to the situation.

Congress enacted a bill which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate and which Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, introduced in the House, establishing a national Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

We instructed that Commission to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leadings to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and territories. Also the Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of the information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation, and other factors, shall determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976 and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator JACKSON, made a splendid, concise statement on Friday last of the nature of the Commission, its membership and its recommendations leading up to the presentation of the measure before the Senate, S. 20, and of the contents of the bill.

The Commission, appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, followed the mandate of the bill. It was bipartisan, including four Senators and four Representatives equally divided between the parties. The seven citizen members appointed by Mr. Eisenhower were, as the bill directed, "citizens known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resource uses."

The report of the Commission was a conscientious effort to find the best possible solutions to growing recreation demands.

This is not a Kennedy new idea measure, although the President is to be highly praised for the strong support he

has given it and the whole recreation program.

S. 20 is the product of two decades of national experience with burgeoning recreation demands followed by one of the finest examples of bipartisan—indeed, nonpartisan—study and planning that will be found in the history of our country.

Seldom have a group laid their partisanship aside so completely, outlined factual studies, enlisted technicians and experts in the field, and made so thorough a study of a major national problem.

The bill which created the Commission was introduced on February 5, 1957, by Senators Anderson, Murray, Watkins, Carroll, Barrett, Kuchel, Allott, Neuberger, Morse, Mundt, and Goldwater—six Republicans and five Democrats.

The congressional posts on the Commission were divided equally between the parties. The politics of some of the commissioners appointed by President Eisenhower aren't known to most of us.

We can assume that the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, brother of the Republican Governor of New York, is a Republican. One or two other of the citizen members of the Commission could be suspected of being Republicans by their identities outside the Commission, but within the Commission there was no way to tell whether Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan, and any of the others were Democrats or Republicans. I can testify that they have acted on this work without political or partisan prejudice.

The whole group—including the congressional members—were citizens and conservationists working together to dig out the facts and develop a sound national recreation policy and program to supplant the piecemeal and inadequate efforts of the individual agencies of government at both the Federal and State levels.

The adjectives "piecemeal" and "inadequate" are used here without any implication of criticism whatever.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service were criticized for asking as much as they did in Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors. No one can properly do anything but commend them for their early responses to the emerging problem of surging recreational demand.

Congress was not so farseeing that we pressed extra authorizations and appropriations on them with an injunction to do more than they had proposed.

Nor is Congress to be criticized. When we realized the size of the problem, we made arrangements to get the facts by the creation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report of the Commission is, to my way of thinking, one of the finest ever submitted to Congress. It was expensive. The Nation invested more than \$2 million in its preparation. It is worth every penny if we carry it out. It is backed up by an extensive inventory of outdoor recreation areas in the Nation, including the names of approximately 10,000 of them, plus the managing agency, acre-

age, county location, facilities available and much other data. It is backed up further by 25 studies of special problems involved in planning a proper recreation program. There are studies of the place of wilderness in a recreation program, of shoreline resources, hunting, and fishing. There is an extensive study of the types of recreation people enjoy and of the quality required to give the users satisfaction. More than 16,000 people were questioned extensively on their recreation activities, reactions, and aspirations to determine accurately the nature and extent of public demand.

The Commission studied the proper role of each level of government in meeting recreation needs. Study No. 11 is of the private role in supplying outdoor recreation demand, a careful appraisal of how far the Government should go, and how much of the load private agencies and private enterprise can meet.

There was detailed analysis of Government agencies involved in the recreation field, and of how Government could best organize itself to carry on a recreation program.

Copies of the Commission report were sent to every Member of Congress and I hope that every Member will get out his copy and examine it carefully before we vote on S. 20. Its thoroughness cannot fail to impress any openminded person.

It is to the credit of the Commission that it did not do as so many commissions do, and dodge the tough, controversial questions.

The Commission outlined a recreation policy for the U.S. Government and then it blueprinted in detail how that policy should be translated into action programs. It made recommendations on where responsibilities should be assigned, what should be done, and how the bill for such work should be paid.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established by Secretary of the Interior Udall in April last year was not only recommended by the Commission, but its functions were outlined in detail—the very same functions that S. 20 proposes to have it discharge.

The citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission served without compensation. They were all able people, unselfishly contributing many, many days of their time to their Government. We met for 50 days. It took at least that many more days to study over the reports and prepare for the meetings.

Those of us in Congress are accustomed to harsh comment. But I would deeply regret that men like Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan; Bernard Orell, of Weyerhaeuser Lumber; Frederick Smith, of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and some of the other citizen members might have been disturbed by a stern statement in opposition, as their first recommendation comes to the floor. They deserve our very great gratitude.

Mr. President, we frequently need the assistance of gifted citizens in the solution of major problems. We have used such commissions of citizens many times. They have the ability to take



problems outside the partisan arena and study them objectively. None has ever done a finer job than this group, headed by Laurance Rockefeller. None has ever done a more conscientious job.

I am sure that the minority leader with his usual fairness, did not intend to indicate a lack of appreciation for what the citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission did. S. 20 is not a "bright new idea" of the Kennedy administration; in reality it is the thoughtful, carefully considered and unanimous recommendation of a bipartisan group including some very splendid and outstanding citizens.

There will be at least one more measure following this one before the present Congress to implement the ORRRC report. It is now before the Interior Committee. There has been some objection to some features in it. We are going to study them carefully in the committee. I am hopeful that a fine bill will finally be presented to the Senate.

So, the sharp comment which has been made about S. 20, may ultimately serve an excellent purpose in identifying the source of this piece of recreation legislation and the impelling reasons why it has come before us with strong bipartisan support.

I trust that it will pass and I am gratified that the minority leader has relented somewhat on his call for all-out resistance to the bill.

**MR. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, as indicated by the majority leader, I had intended to ask for a yea-and-nay vote; and by unanimous consent it was determined that that vote would come on Tuesday, March 12, at 3 o'clock p.m.

I prefer to have the yea-and-nay vote come on an implementing bill which, so far as I can tell, will shortly be reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill is S. 859. It provides the sinew and the substance to give real validity to the pending bill.

However, I am still opposed to the bill, as such, which is before the Senate. I am opposed to it because, in effect, it enlarges the functions of a bureau which was created by an order of the Secretary of the Interior last year. The bill now contains a congressional finding and, in addition, spells out a vast variety of authority that shall be handled through the Bureau for Outdoor Recreation. The only allusion in the bill to funds is that the Bureau shall have authority to accept donations and contributions.

I believe we are faced with the enactment of a bill which would authorize Treasury advances, over a period of 8 years, of a maximum of \$60 million a year. Those advances would be interest free; and if the whole potential were authorized and were utilized, it would mean that this Bureau in the Department of the Interior could then expend up to \$480 million to advance moneys for the purpose recited in the pending bill. There would be no requirement to repay out of the so-called fund, to be established in the companion bill, until the 11th year. That is just another method of back-door financing.

I do not know why these bills were not combined. I do not know why the whole package, including the authorization and

the funds to be used to cover those authorizations, was not set before us in a single bill. However, the fact is that the bill before the Senate is a naked authorization and a finding. That is extremely interesting, because in the very first section of S. 20 the bill recites:

That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, that is a pretty big package, I must say, when we talk about the quantity and the quality which are needed and are desirable. It reminds me of a former British Prime Minister, of whom someone once asked, "Why don't you let the country live like gentlemen?"

The Prime Minister replied, "To let the country live like gentlemen would soon mean bankruptcy for the Empire."

Mr. President, there ought to be some limitations provided in the bill. The bill contains rather fancy words, when it extends a finding by Congress as to how far we shall go in this field.

Mr. President, in the order issued on April 2, 1962, by the Secretary of the Interior, the so-called spending functions of the National Park Service were transferred to the new Outdoor Recreation Bureau. This, then, under S. 20, now before us, is an expansion and the creation of a great many new functions which this agency would undertake. In a sense it is, then, a new function; and, as such, it will require new obligatory authority, which will come in a later bill, in the form of advances.

Mr. President, I would be the last Member of the Senate to be opposed to the development of the outdoor resources of this country. I was born in the country; I sort of grew up in the country; I have the same deep desire to enjoy the outdoors that anyone else does; and I do wish to see those functions properly developed. But I have to measure the undertaking of a vast function at this time—and I emphasize the words "at this time"—against the fiscal problems presently before us.

We are confronted with what is popularly referred to as a \$99 billion budget. But, Mr. President, actually we are not confronted with a \$99 billion budget; we are confronted with a \$108 billion budget, because the \$99 billion budget, as has been emphasized, is the administrative budget; it is the spending budget. However, it does not include the new obligatory authority, which amounts to a little more than \$9 billion. So let us be realistic about this matter, and put the budget in the correct light, and call it what it is; namely, a \$108 billion budget.

We are confronted with an amazing deficit—estimated various at up to \$12 billion—for the fiscal year 1964.

The rest of the fiscal program embraces the recommendations of the President that there be tax reduction and tax reform, scattered over a 3-year period; so that probably the net budget deficit might be in the \$10 or \$11 billion range.

Mr. President, what a strange thing to make a request for tax reduction and a \$108 billion budget, and then undertake \$9 billion of new functions and activities, and in so doing jeopardize the solvency of our country. That is the matter which concerns me; and I intend to lift my voice against these new authorizations. Furthermore, others will be requested, including some for the domestic Peace Corps, which presently is in the making.

I am advised that at 736 Jackson Place, in Washington, D.C., applications for the domestic Peace Corps are being accepted—although, in fact, Congress has not acted on that subject, and there is no domestic Peace Corps. But one can go to that address on Jackson Place—only a stone's throw from the White House—and can procure a form 57, to make application for work in an agency which does not exist.

That situation reminds me of the old ditty:

The other day upon the stair,  
I saw a man who wasn't there.  
He wasn't there again, today,  
I hope that man will go away.

In short, Mr. President, this agency "isn't there," but, notwithstanding that fact, it is accepting applications. I think that is a rather astonishing state of affairs. It is in the field of new obligatory authority, new functions, and new activities, along with the Youth Corps and others.

So, Mr. President, in light of our fiscal responsibilities and the obligations which will be placed upon the Government and upon the country's taxpayers, I do not see—in all good conscience—how Congress can undertake to authorize new functions and to spend additional sums and to derive them by a very interesting and appealing back-door method, because the companion bill, on which hearings have been held, and which I apprehend will in the not-too-distant future inch itself to the floor of the Senate, for consideration, contains an authorization for advances from the Treasury over an 8-year period, interest free. If my arithmetic is worth anything, I find that eight times \$60 million is \$480 million. Furthermore, the bill provides that repayment will not begin until the 11th year. So \$480 million in advances from the Treasury, interest free, would be authorized; and then there would be a hiatus or a grace period of 3 years, before certain revenues would be supposed to be available out of the conservation fund, in order to be able to make reimbursement.

Mr. President, that is an ingenious proposal; but it occurs to me that the appropriate way would be to come in with this bill and with a request for the required appropriations, and then permit the Senate to work its will upon the proposal, because that is not only the simple approach; it is also the accepted approach; and, in my judgment, it is the constitutional approach.

Mr. President, returning to the bill now before us, let me point out that it would do the following, among other things: It would provide for an inventory of the needs and resources of our people in the

field of outdoor recreation. It calls for an evaluation of those needs and resources. It provides for a system of classification of those resources. It calls for a nationwide plan of needs and "demands."

Mr. President, I presume there are a great many things that could be demanded; but, after all, the criterion should be whether we can afford them in the light of the program the President has submitted to Congress. Among other things, another function or activity would be "to identify outdoor problems." Mr. President, that is a mouthful.

We could gather a whole team of people—in fact, battalions of people—put them on the payroll, and send them forth in the country to identify outdoor problems, and they would never run out of identification work.

Then, of course, comes the crux of the thing—to recommend solutions for the problems. Those problems could be legion. I presume the solutions would be legion, too. Then to identify desirable actions by local governments—what an endless job that would be.

Then they would submit a so-called 5-year plan. It seems to me that I have heard of 5-year plans before in other areas of the earth. After the first 5-year plan, the program would doubtless require modification; so there would be authority to adduce and submit a second 5-year plan, with all necessary future revisions.

Then our old friend appears—research. Research is one of those words which have crept into the contemporary lexicon. It can cover a multitude of sins as well as a multitude of virtues.

Then they will be authorized to contract for studies. What kind of studies? Education programs, technical assistance, and other agencies. Other agencies would be allowed to spend their own money to help, with or without reimbursement. There is latitude like a 40-acre field when we say to an agency of government, "Any other agency can help you with its own funds." That has about it an aura of indirect appropriation in my book.

Perhaps it would be interesting to test out a point of order on some of the language that we find in Senate bill 20 now before us.

Mr. President, all the new authority proposed would be meaningless unless it were implemented with money. The necessary money is not provided in the pending bill. It will come in Senate bill 859. Senate bill 859 is, to say the least, an interesting bill. It is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963. It contains wording which is similar, identic, and comparable to what is contained in Senate bill 20, now before us. There again appear the words "quality and quantity as are necessary and desirable." Then the bill provides funds for "Federal acquisition of certain land and water areas."

Mr. President, where are the funds to be obtained to give implementation to Senate bill 20? The related provision begins on page 2 of Senate bill 859, which was introduced on February 19 of this year by quite a number of cosponsors.

What is the first source of funds? It would be "entrance and user fees." These are the entrance and user fees that cover our national outdoor resources, our parks, and recreational areas; and it would be for the President to determine what the fees and charges should be.

Among other things, the bill provides:

The proceeds from fees or charges established by the President pursuant to this subsection for entrance or admission generally to Federal areas shall be used solely for the purposes of this act.

So we see in that provision a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose a fee, an admission charge, or a user charge. It is not unlike providing authority to impose a tax.

When that suggestion was made in a larger frame last year, Congress got its hackles up about the idea of giving the President authority to modify taxes at its own will and desire. But now we see again proposed a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose charges at the very same time that deep concern has been manifested to make sure that people in the low- and middle-income tax brackets get their full and fair share of the tax cut. So it is suggested that we put the cut for those people in one place, and put a new charge on them in another. No wonder that item begot such animated conversation and discussion in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No wonder the committee members fulminated about user charges and admissions.

Mr. President, there is a broader grant of authority with respect to fees and user charges. These would apply to the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

This is the authority:

The President is authorized to provide for the establishment, revision, or amendment of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the Federal agencies listed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, nor shall it authorize fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation.

Mr. President, in S. 859 and I think in S. 20, there is a provision for utilization of some of these areas for commercial purposes.

I point out the grant of power, and I point out the sources of funds to go into the so-called conservation fund with which to reimburse that fund after 8 years of interest-free advances; the reimbursement not to begin until the 11th year.

There is another source of funds, Mr. President, and that is surplus property sales. If I read that section correctly, it would take in what we receive on all sales of real property and related personal property, with an exception. And, insofar as I can tell, that exception is nothing more than the \$8½ million of administrative expenses which are au-

thorized in the independent offices appropriation bill.

In addition, there is another source of funds. That is the motorboat fuels tax.

Finally, there may be one or two other items in the bill of no particular moment.

But those, Mr. President, are the funds which are to be taken from Treasury receipts, and at some time 11 years from now to be used in order to reimburse the Treasury Department for these recreation and conservation purposes.

This is an astonishing approach, Mr. President. It could not have been more complicated if they had set out to make it so. I do not know whether the commission which was set up in the nature of an advisory commission in the Eisenhower administration to make all these recommendations did so or not, but they certainly could have brought it within the frame of simple appropriations, instead of 8 years of tax free advances.

I emphasize one other thing, and that is that this is essentially and definitely a new function. We ought to be pretty careful about expanding the functions of government at a time when the whole fiscal fabric is so uneasy, when there is a hope that a huge and deep tax slash can get the country from its sideways motion and get it to moving again, a hope so earnestly expressed some 2 years ago, shortly after the inauguration.

One should not trifle with the solvency of the country at a time like this, and I do not propose to do so. So I am opposed to what is before us today, though not because I oppose the objectives as such. I think those are desirable. The question is, What can we afford in the country at a given time?

Government financing in a sense is not unlike family financing. If a family is to spend out of pocket for the things which are desirable, as the bill points out, how long can it remain solvent? How long can the family maintain solvency and credit?

How long will it be before government credit will become a little shaky, in view of the fact that the Congress in this session will be confronted with a request to boost the public debt to perhaps \$320 billion or \$325 billion, and to accept a deficit, and to put the imprimatur of approval upon not a \$99 billion budget, Mr. President, but upon a \$108 billion budget? Let us be honest about it, because the new obligatory authority may begin with a little money this year, but it will become the predicate for increases year after year, and year after year, and the budget will then start going into orbit all over again. That is what we are confronted with at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This morning I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to the mass transportation bill. That supposedly involves a 3-year expenditure of \$500 million by way of gifts, but it was thoroughly apparent during the questions that were asked that the program will not be a 3-year program but, in all probability, a permanent program. There is an exam-



ple of the built-in authorizations and what eventually occurs—growing larger and larger all the time, making us more and more incapable of reducing the debt and more and more incapable of reducing the deficits, precipitating us into fiscal trouble of graver and graver consequence all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from Ohio wants a classic example, I point out to him that the Peace Corps started with \$5 million of borrowed funds. The next year they asked for and received \$30 million. The following year they received \$58 million. If the Senator will take a look at that unexpurgated Sears, Roebuck catalog we call the U.S. budget he will find that for fiscal year 1964 they do not want \$5 million, or \$30 million, or \$58 million—they are asking for \$108 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If one wants an example of classic growth, there it is.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the 6 years I have been in the Senate I have repeatedly listened to the argument that the initial expenditure for a proposed new program was inconsequential; but during those 6 years it has repeatedly been shown, time after time, that what in the beginning was inconsequential grew into proportions of great consequence as the years went by. Not a single one of the programs that began in a sort of miniature size failed to grow. They never stayed at that small size. They never got smaller. They grew and grew all the time, like Topsy. That has been my experience in the 6 years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remind my distinguished friend from Ohio that some years ago—and I think my figures are correct—there was an interesting little board in Government called the Board of Geographic Names. It was in the Department of the Interior, as I recall. In that bureau were three persons. Their job was to examine and to ascertain where our soldiers were serving, to find the names of villages, towns, and so forth, and have diacritical marks placed on the names so soldiers could pronounce them.

I am not positive, but the next time I looked into the matter, it did not have 3 employees; there were 100 persons in that bureau.

Talk about getting liquidated—it is like pulling teeth. The best medicine is not to let them get out of hand in the first instance. Then we will not have to fight all over hell's half acre to get them liquidated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The aspects of the problem pointed out by the Senator from Illinois are serious, but there is another facet to the problem which, in my opinion, is graver. Those who say we spend little, that we should not worry about it, are making that argument knowing in their minds that next year they are going to ask for substantial increases. That is the grave aspect of the problem. It is grave because on one side we are

fighting juvenile delinquency, badness of youth, while on the other side, by our example, by our approach to problems, we are showing a base, a twisted, a deceptive mind, knowing, as time goes on, that the innocent presentations made at the beginning are going to become entirely false by what, in our expectation, is going to be done in the future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I can say to my friend from Ohio that when I came here 30 years ago the Federal budget was a little over \$4 billion for all purposes, including national defense. I do not ask the country to stand still. I do not expect it to stand still. I expect funds to be expended, that appropriations will grow from year to year; but I do expect, in connection with annual appropriations and the contingent liabilities of Government, that the Government will maintain a posture which does not jeopardize our solvency, for if the time ever came when we had to use a peremptory weapon like a moratorium, I would not like to see the shudder in the chancelleries of the world and what would happen to credit. It would make October 29, 1929, look like a picnic before we got through.

Let us stop for a moment to consider the commitments that have been made. We owe the civil service retirement fund \$37 billion. We agreed solemnly as a Congress that we would put in half and match the fund for every Federal employee. There are over 600,000 former Federal employees living in a retired status. They paid their share because we took it out of their pay checks. The Government has not paid its share. We owe that fund \$37 billion. Perhaps we can put a moratorium on it. Perhaps we can engage in fancy financing if we like. But we still owe it, and it is a Government obligation. We owe the military funds and a great many other funds. There are so many contingent liabilities we have that it will probably amount to \$450 billion before we get through.

We know the status of our fiscal structure. We cannot duck it. We cannot continue to put straws on the camel's back, under those circumstances, without inviting trouble.

Mr. President, there is little I need add to what I have said. This is a new function that is proposed. I am quite familiar with provisions for matching and the division as between the Federal Government and the States. I know about the payback provisions. I know the differences between matching and planning as distinguished from acquisition and development. But the fact of the matter is that this is a new authorization for expenditure. The provision for the money will come very shortly out of the same committee that sent this bill to the Senate floor. It will mean new obligations at a time when our fiscal problems are of the most solemn and serious nature.

Deep as my devotion is to the whole question of outdoor recreation, I still believe our first obligation is to the continuing solvency of the United States of America. That is the overriding consideration. That is the reason why I

raise my voice with respect to the bill that is before us today.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to the pending business, S. 20, which expresses the interest of the Congress in recreational facilities throughout this country.

The rapid progress which our Nation is making on all fronts—in automation, transportation, technology, education, and research—tends to provide increasing amounts of leisure for our people. It is most appropriate for us to recognize that our increased time from labor can cause us many headaches in the future unless we make every effort to see that it will be used in a healthy fashion. We must be sure that it will not evolve into simply time on our hands—into an excuse for boredom and lethargy.

We all know how difficult a problem the blessings of agricultural surpluses has become for us. We do not know what to do with good fortune; and the situation will grow worse until we make preparations to meet it.

So it is with leisure. We must be prepared to use it wisely, or it will confront us with seeds of decay.

Recreation, and its handmaiden, tourism, is a most important industry in my State of Vermont. I believe most sincerely that these two luxuries will soon become a very important necessity both to our economy and to the well-being of the American people. Vermonters have recognized this, and we have been making great strides to provide increased recreational and tourist facilities throughout our State.

Turning to the bill, S. 20, itself, I want to make two comments.

First, I am glad to see that the committee has amended the bill to include private interests, in its technical assistance provisions, and not simply to limit such assistance to State and political subdivisions.

Second, I am happy to note that the bill requires the Government to cooperate with educational institutions in research and other educational programs and activities to encourage wise use of leisure through recreation.

Mr. President, this bill is a step in the right direction. We recognize the perils of ever increasing leisure time unless we seek means to provide for its wise use. I am sure Vermont will play an ever increasing role in the rapidly expanding recreation and tourist industries. Already my State is well on the way with its plans for the future in this area. Fortunately, with a program such as is contemplated in this bill, coupled with the energies of the people of Vermont and other sections of the country, we will be prepared to prevent leisure from becoming an excuse for idleness.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words on the general subject covered by Senate bill 20, though probably not exactly in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said. I also wish to make a few remarks with respect to Senate bill 859 while I am speaking.

In the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear that I shall support the bill now that it includes the amendment

which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico added earlier in the day, which provides that Revised Statutes section 3648, 39 U.S.C. 4154, will not be wholly done away with in the operation of the proposed act. That section provides that the United States may not pay for services or for goods until they have been performed or delivered.

The bill now pending, S. 20, as originally written, authorized the Secretary of Interior to make payments without regard for the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes. In my opinion, such a provision was unthinkable, and I have never been shown any real reason why the exemption should be allowed with the exception of educational institutions.

In committee we struck out that portion of the bill, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has submitted—and the Senate has adopted—an amendment which provides that it shall apply only with respect to research with regard to educational institutions or other nonprofit organizations.

While this particular amendment is satisfactory to me, I believe that we should make exceptions to the original act only in most unusual circumstances. We do in this instance with respect to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, upon the basis that they cannot get these projects started unless in some instances the Government does provide funds with which to start them.

For the sake of legislative history on the bill I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as adopted refers to "initial" costs of such research. It provides an exemption for initial costs of such research if the Secretary deems it necessary. It is not an accident that the word "initial" is included. It is in there because it is meant to be in there. It means that the Government shall not finance these projects in advance, *carte blanche*, but that only the initial cost shall be taken care of, and then only with respect to educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations.

Upon this basis I will support the bill. It should be observed, however, that what we are really doing is to give legislative sanction to a bureau already established and in operation—this one was set up a year ago. Our action today is *ex post facto*, a practice we have had to engage in many times in the last 2 years.

I must say that the gentleman who heads this Bureau, Mr. Crafts, is one of the most capable Government employees I have ever met. I have great faith in his integrity and in his ability to do a good job with respect to these recreational resources.

I wish to say, too, that what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said is accurate. We are now operating, without any authority from Congress, with something like 75 people, if I recall correctly, in this unauthorized Bureau of the Federal Government, set up by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Crafts says that if the bill is enacted there will be 200 employees by the end of the year. Therefore, Parkinson's law is in operation.

When we get to the consideration of S. 859, which is the land funding portion of this bill, and which provides for a system of user fees to all national parks and all national forests, for a tax on motor fuel, and then goes to the absurdity of providing that all money realized from the sales of Federal surplus property, real and personal, will also go into this fund, I expect to have a little more to say. I wish to say right now that when that bill comes on the floor it is going to be discussed at great length. I do mean great length. It violates many basic principles of taxation, and in my opinion, as it now reads, in its present form, it is wholly unacceptable.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I would be the last person to suggest that there are not some good things which would flow from the passage of S. 20 and that there are not some worthwhile groups and individuals interested in this subject.

Certainly what I am about to say does not reflect upon the fine Senators who have interested themselves in the proposed legislation.

I shall oppose the bill, and my reason is quite simple. I believe that we are so far in debt, that our deficit is so large, that we have to say no to some desirable things. At this time I will not try to establish a priority of what proposals are most desirable. The simple fact remains that our national debt will have increased in the first 4 fiscal years of this administration by \$30 billion. I called the Treasury to ask what was the average rate of interest paid on the debt, and, as I recall it, I was told it was 3.288. This means that the Government of the United States in 4 years has placed upon the backs of the people an additional billion dollars a year in interest alone. It means that year after year after year, unless at some time we start paying off this debt, it will carry a penalty for the mismanagement of Government in these 4 years of a billion dollars a year.

Frankly, I am concerned about the people who are entitled to some recreation. I think they can get a little more enjoyable recreation if the burdens of Government are not quite so heavy.

Therefore, I shall not support the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the outdoor recreation resources review report appearing at page 122, entitled "Its Creation and Composition," be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### ITS CREATION AND COMPOSITION

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be created by vesting it with authority to carry out the functions proposed for it and transferring to it those national recreation planning responsibilities now lodged in the Secretary of the Interior and exercised by the National Park Service under the Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study Act of 1936.

The new Bureau should be headed by a Director and should have a small, highly qualified planning and administrative staff in Washington. Wherever possible, the Bureau should be staffed by transfer of ex-

perienced personnel from existing agencies. Regional offices should be located so as to provide effective assistance to other Federal and State agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted a report to the 87th Congress and to President Kennedy. The report was based on an exhaustive 3-year study by that Commission, a Commission, incidentally, created by the 85th Congress during the previous administration, bipartisan in composition, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, and numbering its members several of my distinguished colleagues here present. The several citizen members of that Commission were appointed by President Eisenhower.

This report made a number of specific recommendations designed to assure adequate outdoor recreational opportunity for living Americans—today—and for generations yet unborn—tomorrow. Prominent among these recommendations was one to establish in the Federal Government a bureau to act as a focal point for the planning and coordination of outdoor recreation programs. The need for such an organization was so obvious and so urgent that the administration, acting under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1950, shifted certain funds and certain functions from other bureaus and established in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

A bill introduced in the last Congress, which passed the Senate, would have given formal congressional sanction to this action. That bill, however, included an additional provision for grants to the States for outdoor recreational planning, and at the late stage in the session when it reached the House, it was not possible for that body to explore sufficiently all the ramifications of the proposal, so the measure was not enacted. This bill we are considering today, S. 20, does not include that provision. Its purpose is to give congressional recognition to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and to delineate what its functions and responsibilities shall be.

Attempts have been made to demonstrate a relationship between this measure and S. 859 which would establish a land and water conservation fund and provide how such a fund would be used. But at this time I want to point out emphatically that there is no connection between these two measures other than that both relate to outdoor recreation. This bill, S. 20, gives specific statutory status to a small bureau which can coordinate the outdoor recreational activities of more than 20 Federal and more than 500 State agencies which have responsibilities in this field. Further, this Bureau will act as a focal point for the planning needed to assure the orderly development of the facilities required to meet the mushrooming demands of Americans for outdoor recreational opportunity. Its budget request is moderate, only \$1,115,000 more than has been appropriated in the past for two National Park Service functions now being performed by that Bureau.



Yet it has the mission of developing a national outdoor recreation plan, of coordinating State recreational planning, of aiding the States in all aspects of outdoor recreation, of reviewing and coordinating the outdoor recreational programs of some 20 Federal agencies to prevent overlap, eliminate unnecessary expense, and to assure that Federal investment in this field is best designed to meet national needs, of stimulating needed research, and of disseminating needed information and educational material.

It contemplates a staff of only 225 employees to perform its broad responsibilities.

This is a long-needed planning and coordinating agency in the outdoor recreation field. It will prevent waste and duplication of effort. It will see that Federal, State and local recreation programs follow an orderly pattern. Its formation follows the recommendation of a bipartisan commission established during the last administration. I urge passage of S. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.*

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of gov-

ernment and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interest including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it

stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Thursday next, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the money resolutions which affect the conduct of affairs of the various committees during the year.

#### A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs POWELL," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 3, 1963.

The article relates some of the problems with respect to the recent furor over the actions of a Member of the House of Representatives, and also includes an editorial entitled "A Des Moines Negro View," which first appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes. The editorial takes a point of view of the situation entirely different from that expressed in a Washington, D.C., newspaper published for Negroes.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEGRO PAPER BACKS POWELL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Critics of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should not indulge in the illusion that he lacks prestige in the nationwide Negro community, or that the recent attacks on POWELL have shaken this prestige very much.

POWELL is much admired as a symbol even by those who may deplore some of his acts. He seems to many Negroes to be one of their race who has broken through racial prejudice to stand on his own as an individual.

In Washington, with its 54 percent Negro population and its 84 percent Negro school enrollment, criticism of POWELL raps on raw nerves in the Negro community.

#### REACTED ANGRILY

The Washington Afro-American, one of the chain of newspapers which strongly affects Negro opinion, reacted angrily to the attempt of Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington bureau to pin down POWELL at a press conference. The prize-winning investigative reporter was probing POWELL on the charges of Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, who accuses POWELL of extensive abuses of his congressional position with the connivance of Kennedy administration officials.

The reporter, a Drake University football star once optioned to the New York Giants, was criticized in a page 1 story in the Afro-American both for his questions and his physical condition.

"The pasty-faced Mollenhoff, who resembled a former shotputter who has let himself go to pot, tried repeatedly with just a trace of preciousness in his slightly lisping voice to put POWELL on the spot," the article stated. It continued with its derision of the reporter but told little of either the questions or answers at the press conference.

An editorial in the Afro-American elaborated on these views, centering its attack on Senator WILLIAMS and Columnist Drew Pearson. The editorial predicted the day would come when "this great civil rights fighter [POWELL] attains even greater heights."

"When he does," the editorial continued, "18 million colored thumbs are going to go up to 18 million colored noses to remind Drew Pearson and Senator WILLIAMS that 'what's good for you white geese is sure good for us colored ganders.'"

The editor of the Washington Afro-American is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., who signed his name to the page 1 news article as "Chuck Stone."

Stone will not long remain as editor of the Afro-American. He has been appointed public affairs officer in the U.S. Information Service and will be placed in charge of the office in Tanganyika. His responsibility there will be to carry out programs of USIA intended to give to the residents of the former British colony in east Africa a clear and accurate picture of conditions, opinions, attitudes, and culture of the United States.

Stone says that he expects to go to Tanganyika in April. He reinforces in conversation his views stated in the Afro-American.

"I could take you into the bars and barber shops and street corners in Washington and show you that 95 percent of the colored people think that the attack on POWELL was clearly racial," he says.

"POWELL has pulled a lot of deals we don't like, but if he is going to be criticized it has got to be on the Negro's terms."

#### ANOTHER NEGRO VIEW

It is impossible to convince Stone and most Negroes within sound and sight of POWELL that WILLIAMS was inspired by anything but racial feelings in spite of his long record to the contrary, and in spite of the role he has played over many years in the exposure of serious abuses in Government.

Negroes sharing the view of Stone, and only grudgingly aware of POWELL's long and flagrant violation of generally accepted congressional standards, white or Negro, cannot conceive of any but a racial reason for WILLIAMS' attack.

This is saddening. It is more saddening that POWELL can play upon the misguided Negro racism which is so evident in the words and tone of the Washington Afro-American.

The dialog between the races in Washington does not seem to be improving in anywhere near the measure that the circumstances justify. Nor is it reassuring that the well-mannered, well-dressed, but passionately spoken Stone is going to Tanganyika to interpret America to the people and officialdom of an emerging nation.

#### DIFFERENT VIEW

We get quite a different view than Stone's of Negro attitudes when another Negro journalist, Simeon Booker, of Ebony magazine, speaks. Booker is writing a book which he intends to make a balanced account of the need for Negro self-improvement as well as a plea for the opening of fairer opportunities.

He points out that POWELL does not have much support or sympathy "among people who think." Booker's tool is rationality; Stone's is emotion; POWELL's is flimflam.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

#### A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

(The following editorial appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes.)

It often happens that some people, placed in a position of responsibility and prominence, use this situation to abuse it by doing things a far less prepared citizen does. Rep-

resentative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, is an excellent example of this.

A minister of one of the largest churches in America, elected from a district comprising mostly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, POWELL has moved up to chairmanship of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee. In this post, he could be a power in Congress and serve as an example for younger people to point to with pride that a Negro had attained such a commanding position.

There are those who opposed his elevation to that high post but the system of seniority made the choice automatic.

However, Representative POWELL, unlike some other Negroes serving in Congress, has abused his position by his continued absenteeism from duty, by loading up his staff far out of proportion to the other chairmen. He has abused the expenditure of public funds and he has failed or refused to pay his taxes to the Government which pays his salary.

These derelictions of duty have brought stern criticism from Members of both Houses to the extent never before witnessed, and all because the charges lodged against him are true.

Here is a public servant, a minister who, instead of conducting himself in a straightforward manner, has done many things which bring disgrace, distrust, and shame, while representing a district whose people are entitled to a leader who should bring honor and prestige to the position which he holds. There is no excuse for Representative POWELL's conduct. It should not be condoned.

#### ADLAI STEVENSON'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOVIETS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of March 7, 1963.

In his article, Mr. Wilson, a distinguished columnist, indicates some concern over the fact that the U.S. representative to the United Nations has apparently taken such a long time to come to grips with the nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### WILSON FINDS ADLAI SLOW TO UNDERSTAND SOVIETS

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In an interview with the Associated Press, Adlai E. Stevenson has revealed the attitude of mind toward Russian negotiations which so many have found hard to understand.

With 2 years' experience as U.N. Ambassador, Stevenson says that he has changed his mind about the Russians. He has discovered that they will stubbornly support positions which they seem fully prepared to reverse when it is expedient to do so.

It seems odd that Stevenson would have had to learn such a lesson, for this has been the uniform experience of Secretaries of State for the last quarter of a century. Stevenson has been a student of foreign affairs for at least that long.

#### EXPECTED RUSSIA TO ACCOMMODATE

Stevenson's statement is implicit confirmation that the Kennedy administration came into office with the belief that a new set of conditions with Russia could be created. The United States should be able to accommodate itself in some ways to Russian policy, and, in turn, if the negotiators

were skillful enough, Russian policy would make accommodations, too.

Thus Secretary Rusk began his "quiet" diplomatic moves. President Kennedy conferred with Premier Khrushchev. New thoughts were formulated by Walt W. Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, and Paul Nitze.

Under almost all conditions new solutions were pursued. About all this has proved was that the American political administration had changed, but the Russian political administration had not.

Still, the idea that the Russians could somehow be made to see the light was hard to put down. This frame of mind has persisted right through the Cuban crisis, manifesting itself in the care exercised in not pushing Khrushchev too far, too fast when he was so obviously on the run.

#### THINKS RUSSIANS CAN BE HANDLED

The result, to borrow a phrase from Columnist Arthur Krock, has been half-won victories, which the administration continually advertises as great triumphs.

In the wake of Khrushchev's withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a wave of euphoria washed over Washington. Large but poorly described changes were foreseen. There were premonitions of some new order in the world based on Khrushchev's back down and his quarrel with his Chinese allies. It was supposed that the noncommitted nations were losing their fascination with Russia. Administration officials spoke of the missile withdrawal as if it were some historic turning point.

But now all the airy castles built on the shifting sands of the imagined new world order are coming tumbling down. The cold war seems to have been renewed. Khrushchev is seen to have achieved important objectives in Cuba, though not all he sought. The test ban negotiations are again in a state of collapse. We are warned once again that Russia will burn us up if we touch Cuba.

#### TROOPS ARE STILL THERE

It does not appear that there is much to be gained by not pressing advantages against the Soviet Union to their full limit when it was possible to do so, as in Cuba. Now, months after the fullest pressure could have been brought, Russian troops are still in Cuba. We do not know how many are being taken out. Nor have we achieved all the aims we sought when we confronted the world with the imminent prospect of nuclear war.

There is enough now to confirm Stevenson's new-found wisdom about the Russians. We should keep the pressure on them when we can and gain the most from it. Only too soon they will have found new ways to move toward their unchanging general objectives.

#### SUMMERTIME STUDENT JOBS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Plum Jam," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 7, 1963. The editorial relates to the recent announcement that appointments of student trainees to Federal jobs during the summertime will be cleared through the White House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### PLUM JAM

Each year, more than 10,000 students are given summer jobs by the Federal Government. The jobs mainly are in Washington. Quite a bit of personal political patronage is involved, although the Civil Service Commission requires applicants to pass civil



service examinations for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. In the case of student trainees jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

Now a storm of protest has blown up in Congress following a report in the Washington Star that the White House has taken control of student job patronage. A clearance system reportedly has been set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House, along with information as to home States and the college attended (if any).

Assuming that it is essential in the first place to hire 10,000 students for summer Federal work, the action of the White House in having them all run through the Presidential funnel for clearance fouls the civil service system. Worse yet, this latest action appears to be but another example of a New Frontier attitude that is disdainful of the spirit, if not the law, of Federal civil service.

In a Senate speech rapping the White House student patronage plan, Senator MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, accused the administration of having "an irresistible urge to play politics with our civil service system."

"First," Senator MILLER recalled, "there was the shocking directive to civil service employees that they should be expected to participate in trying to sell proposed new programs to the general public. This was belatedly and grudgingly withdrawn due to the revulsion of the public in general and career civil service employees in particular. Next our civil service employees were pressured to buy \$100 tickets to the Democratic fundraising dinner here through the clever device of having them invited to cocktail parties of their bosses if they had purchased a ticket. . . . And now, this administration apparently is not going to wait until people have civil service status for an opportunity to engage in partisan political activities."

The Kennedy administration defends the plan by saying that its primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when the youths graduate.

Despite this high sounding explanation, the plan is highhanded. It's something new in the way of harvesting political plums—pick 'em while they're green.

#### DELAY SOUGHT ON FEED GRAIN PROGRAM UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Shuman Asks Congress To Wait Until After Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws," published in the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter of March 4, 1963, together with table 1, which indicates the various factors which have occurred in the reduction of the carryover of feed grains. The table points up in an excellent way why the reduction of the carryover in feed grains is due in very minute part to the emergency feed grain program of the last 2 years.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHUMAN ASKS CONGRESS TO WAIT UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM TO WRITE FARM LAWS

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged

Congress to delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963.

He said the legislators should wait until after the sign-up under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and the result of the forthcoming wheat referendum is known.

At a House Agricultural Subcommittee hearing last Thursday, Mr. Shuman said that if the wheat referendum carries, "there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964."

"If the wheat referendum does not carry, which we think more likely, then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together."

"There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program," the Farm Bureau president declared.

"We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known."

Here is the full text of Mr. Shuman's statement at the hearing:

"We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the operation and results of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs. We also would like to comment briefly on the 1963 feed grain program and its implications. Finally, we would like to discuss with this committee a course of action which we believe would be wise and best for farmers."

"Before we get into a detailed discussion of the feed grain program, we would like to urge strongly that this committee delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963, until (1) the sign-up under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and announced and (2) the multiple-price wheat referendum has been held and the result is known."

Our reasons for asking the committee to delay any decision on a feed grain program are:

1. Most feed grains are spring planted. There will be ample time, after the wheat referendum, for action by Congress on a future program for feed grains.

2. The sign-up for the 1963 feed grain program will continue until at least March 22 (or later if the time is extended). No one knows until then what feed grain producer reaction will be to the 1963 compensatory payment program.

3. If the complicated, restrictive, multiple-price wheat program is approved in the upcoming referendum, one set of circumstances will prevail. On the other hand, if it is voted down, this will create substantially different conditions for wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers. If this happens, this committee and the Congress would then most certainly want to reanalyze the entire wheat, feed grain, and livestock problem in order to do justice to all producers. This committee should not tie its own hands by acting prematurely, without having all the facts necessary for sound judgment.

You are well aware of the fact that Farm Bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 farm families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Most of our members produce feed grains and livestock although many, of course, have a larger economic stake in other commodities. A large number produce wheat and feed grains. Our members strongly believe that feed grain and wheat legislation are closely related and that both affect livestock production and prices. We strongly believe that any future programs for feed grains and wheat should be considered together.

#### RESULTS OF 1961 AND 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The administration claims that the so-called emergency feed grain program has been a great success, since the buildup in supplies has been halted and some progress has been made in reducing carryover stocks. What are the facts?

Fact 1. A sizable majority of the eligible producers gave the program a "no confidence" vote by staying out, both in 1961 and 1962.

In 1961 only 42 percent of the farmers with corn and grain sorghum bases signed program contracts. In 1962 contracts were signed by 44 percent of the producers with corn and grain sorghum bases and 29 percent of those with barley bases.

Fact 2. The acreage that was diverted under the program did not result in a corresponding reduction in feed grain plantings.

In 1961 the Government contracted for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959-60 base. In 1962 it contracted for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959-60 base.

In 1959-60 the total acreage planted to the four principal feed grains averaged 151.3 million acres.

In 1961 farmers planted 129.3 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 26.7 million acres. Thus, the total of 156 million acres planted or diverted in 1961 was 4.7 million acres greater than 1959-60 plantings.

In 1962 farmers planted 125.9 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 32.7 million acres. Thus, the total planted plus the acreage diverted rose to 158.6 million acres, or 7.3 million acres more than the average planted in 1959-60.

The increase in feed grain acreage (including diverted acreage) under the program reflects increased plantings by non-participating farmers and adjustments in the base acreage of participating producers.

Fact 3. The production of feed grains was reduced less than the reduction in acreage planted because yields increased.

Apologists for the program have attributed most of the 1961 increase in yields to weather. But yields rose again in 1962. (Per-acre corn yields averaged 53.8 bushels in 1959-60 and rose to 62 bushels in 1961 and 64.1 bushels in 1962.)

In 1961, as compared with the base period 1959-60, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 14.5 percent and the production of four feed grains (total tonnage basis) was reduced 7.9 percent.

In 1962, as compared with the 1959-60 base, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 16.8 percent and the production of four feed grains was reduced 6.2 percent.

Fact 4. The reduction in feed grain stocks has been due almost entirely to increased utilization and not to the Government program.

At the beginning of the 1961 marketing year, feed grain stocks totaled a record of 84.7 million tons.

By the beginning of the current marketing year stocks had been reduced to 71.8 million tons. Only a very small part of this reduction of 12.9 million tons can be attributed to the feed grain program.

The production of feed grains was reduced 15 million tons in 1961, but barley and oats—which were not included in the 1961 program—accounted for 3.1 million tons of this reduction.

One of the most significant factors in the feed grain situation is the increase in utilization which has been occurring. Domestic consumption and exports of feed grains increased 8.1 million tons in the marketing year 1961 (as compared with 1960).

To summarize, under the 1961 program, stocks were reduced 12.9 million tons, but if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in the production of feed grains not covered by the 1961 program, the reduction in carryover would have been less than 2 million tons.

It now appears that stocks will be reduced 10.8 million tons (from 71.8 to 61 million)

during the 1962 marketing year. This reduction is almost entirely accounted for by increased utilization and a reduction in the production of oats. As compared with 1961, total production of feed grains increased 2.5 million tons (from 140.6 million tons to 143.1 million tons) and exports are expected to decline by about 1.7 million tons this year.

By the fall of 1962, feed grain stocks will have been reduced by a total of approximately 23.7 million tons from the 1961 level. But, if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in production of crops not under the program, the total reduction in stocks would be only a little over 2 million tons (see table I). Thus, 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than the effect of the emergency program.

Fact 5. The total direct cost—\$1.7 billion—of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs cannot be justified by what has actually been accomplished under these programs.

#### MARKET PRICES DEPRESSED

Early in 1961, when this committee was discussing the 1961 feed grain program we spoke out against one of its most disturbing features. We called this the obvious threat to use the Government's huge surplus stocks to beat down the market price of feed grains. We denounced this proposal as a brandnew and fallacious concept. We continued to oppose the dumping of CCC feed grain stocks during the 1962 program. We have continually pointed out that this use of CCC stocks is bad for our market system for grain and that it severely penalizes producers who want to sell their feed grains on the market.

As we have already pointed out, considerably more than 50 percent of all feed grain producers stayed out of the feed grain program in 1961 and in 1962. Dumping CCC feed grains on the market held down their market price and, of course, lowered their incomes.

We also pointed out early in 1961 that dumping feed grain stocks onto the market would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for these commodities. Let us review briefly what has happened in this regard.

Poultry and dairy production have continued above what they would have been if CCC stocks of feed grains had not been dumped. Prices of both these commodities have been depressed because of this unwise action.

Numbers of hogs coming to market and cattle on feed and being marketed are also up considerably. Hog prices are down, and top cattle prices have taken one of the sharpest drops in history—over \$7 per hundredweight since last fall. This, too, has been caused in part by the dumping of CCC stocks of feed grain.

We realize that some persons have supported the feed grain program on the ground that it has been an effective way of pouring "free money" from Washington into the feed grain areas. But what is happening currently to livestock, dairy, and poultry prices would indicate a loss in income to feed grain, poultry, dairy, hog, and cattle producers of several times the payments made to feed grain growers under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

#### THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

As we stated previously, it is too early to determine the reaction of feed grain producers to the 1963 program and the results that can be anticipated from its operation. The signup period has several weeks to run.

The 1963 program has most of the bad features of the 1961 and 1962 programs and, in addition, contains a provision for Brannan-type compensatory payments. Since payments are to be made on the "normal" yield of planted acres, they encourage producers

to participate on a minimum basis and to divert their poorest acres.

As members of this committee know, we are opposed to the compensatory payment concept. Our reasons for opposing payments are spelled out in our 1963 policies as adopted by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus:

"Compensatory payments are proposed in a variety of forms. Regardless of the form in which presented, the payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system. It would be fantastically expensive and would stimulate production, increase unit costs, depress market prices, lead to tight production controls, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for a substantial part of their total income.

"Limitations on payments to individuals would place a ceiling on opportunity and level farm incomes downward.

"Payment programs would socialize the production and distribution of food and fiber by having consumers pay a part of the cost through taxes—rather than full value at the store. This is a trap for producers. Ultimately, the payment approach also would be a trap for consumers, since it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high real costs of food and fiber.

"We vigorously oppose any system of compensatory payments for agriculture."

In summary, we strongly urge this committee to delay any further action on a feed grain program until after the multiple price wheat referendum. If the wheat referendum carries, there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964. If the wheat referendum does not carry (which we think more likely), then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

Finally, we have pointed out why we believe the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs have not, and will not, solve the basic problem in feed grain and livestock agriculture. There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program. We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known.

TABLE I.—Factors in the reduction of feed grain stocks  
(In million tons)

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn.....	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum.....	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley.....	—	0	0
Total.....	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley.....	.8	—	.8
Oats.....	2.3	2.0	4.3
Total.....	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year.....	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover.....	-11.2	-10.3	-21.5
Total reduction in carryover.....	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program.....	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of the January 16 issue of the South Dakota Union Farmer, a publication of the Farmers Union in the State of South Dakota. In that issue I found a splendid article entitled "Assignment in South America—Venezuelan Farmers Want To Help Themselves." The article was written by Arlene Schley, education director of the South Dakota Farmers Union, who had visited in South America.

I had the privilege of being in Venezuela last November; and I visited many of the rural areas, and took a great deal of interest in the rural development program.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, is doing an admirable job in the area of what we call agrarian reform, including not only land distribution, but also—and of equal importance—the development of farm co-operatives and the development of supervised credit, at reasonable rates of interest, over a long period in which the farmers can make repayment. In these rural areas I also found the development of housing, public health, and general community programs. It was very encouraging to see people truly helping themselves. The remarkable record of educational development in the rural areas of Venezuela should give all of us encouragement.

In the article Miss Arlene Schley tells—for example—how people there would meet in the out-of-doors—"under the trees," as she writes—while they were working on the construction of new buildings to accommodate their community activities. Her article also points out some of the shortcomings, such as the lack of proper youth programs in the rural areas.

I believe the article will commend itself to the attention of every person who is really interested in what is developing under the Alliance for Progress, and also to the Members of Congress who recognize that rural development in these essentially agrarian countries is of the utmost importance.

I wish to compliment Arlene Schley upon her splendid article and upon the excellent sense of understanding and the perception which she has exhibited in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Dakota Union Farmer, Jan. 16, 1963]

#### VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Arlene Schley)

In Venezuela, the cooperation exhibited to us between the Federacion Campesino (FCV),



the Instituto Agraria Nacional (IAN), and the Ministerio de Agricultura (MAC) stands out as one of the most gratifying aspects of the entire mission. Apparently, at times, there are some areas of disagreement between these groups as any country has overlapping of responsibilities and personality problems. I firmly believe that the way they worked together on our behalf may have far-reaching effects on their close working relationships in the future.

Prior to our visit to Venezuela and during our first week in Caracas, each of the three agencies contacted their offices in the field to notify them of our visits and urged them to plan our itineraries and to set up meetings for us. In this way, they were prepared for us and our only difficulty was to try to reduce the number of activities that they had planned so that our health could stand up for the length of time that we were to be there. In many places, we were presented with written resolutions of welcome and brotherhood to further emphasize the cordiality with which we were received.

The campesinos (farmers) are eager for improvement but at the same time appear to be somewhat frustrated. Now that action has been started by the government on their behalf, in the area of land reform programs, they are impatient for this transitional period to settle down into a way of life fair to all, with fulfillment of their demands for economic and social democracy and human dignity.

We worked in 7 states in Venezuela and during this time we contacted people from 12 states. We traveled in the interior (anywhere outside of Caracas) by Mercedes-Benz autobus for 3 weeks and by plane the fourth week. This car was furnished by IAN as well as the driver. The main highways between cities are good-surfaced roads, but in the course of the 4,000-odd miles we traveled, we covered dirt roads and paths leading from one land reform settlement to the next.

#### MEETS UNDER TREES

We attended and conducted approximately 35 meetings, ranging in attendance from 25 to 500 people, including get-togethers in the shade of a tree to state conventions of delegates. Our second day in the interior, we conducted three meetings between 4:30 p.m. and midnight. By doing this, we were able to meet with more people because we went to their communities, rather than expecting them, with their limited modes of transportation, to come to a central place to meet with us.

In each state, the FCV officials had pre-selected candidates for us to interview in their area for the second phase of our program. This includes inviting a total of 75 campesinos from six Latin American countries to spend 6 months in the United States next year.

The procedure of our meetings varied as much as the situation, location, and attendance at the meetings. In one State, approximately 200 delegates had gathered in a meeting hall on Sunday noon for our meeting. At this time, each of us, with the assistance of our interpreter, explained the various phases of the Farmers Union program, with heavy emphasis on education and cooperatives.

#### LACK JUNIOR PROGRAM

I found that it was very difficult at times to explain our youth education program because of the complete lack of familiarity with this type of thing. Our background is such that we automatically understand that any organization's education program is completely separate from the formal education of our schools.

Yet, in Venezuela, where the highest local educational level is six educational grades, and many only attend from 2 to 4 years, they immediately identified any education

program with the special agricultural schools that they have for young farm boys. Therefore, my presentations usually took the general form of the importance of family participation in an organization that involves a family occupation, as does agriculture.

#### FAMILY TIES STRONG

I found this to be very well received as family ties, for security and other reasons, are very strong. Therefore, they readily accepted the concept of a family organization for family farmers.

The first day, we visited La Morita, the settlement that President and Mrs. Kennedy had visited and we received firsthand the feeling of the tremendous admiration and hope that these people have in Kennedy and his Alliance for Progress. Our reception is beyond description in the warmth and enthusiasm exhibited by the people. The reason for this enthusiasm is easy to explain in very simple terms when you consider the skepticism of these people because of their experience with broken promises in the past. But here, Kennedy had visited and promised assistance.

#### ARLENE-JACKIE

Then we came, not just as a Farmers Union team, but in their minds we were the Alliance for Progress and we were fulfilling a promise of President Kennedy and the United States. We were inviting 25 Venezuelan campesinos to the United States. As a strictly personal note, I would like to say that at this place, they called me "Jackie."

I would also like to insert that it was a little difficult at first, but soon I began to accept the uncanny feeling that I was something of a museum piece to these people. I'm very certain that in most areas, I was the first North American woman to visit them as a member of a project team. That a woman should be on this team was strange to them in itself because it is somewhat apart from what they ordinarily think of as being the accepted role of women in this world. However, I feel that the presence of a woman, in farm organization work, is very essential in rural community development in Latin America; not only in the areas of home and family development but also in the workings of the organization.

#### VISIT OFFICIALS

In several States, arrangements had been made for us to meet and talk with the Governors of the States. In this way, we received not only the welcome from the farm organization and Federal Government agencies, but also from State governments. The graciousness of their receptions included dinners at the Governors' mansions in some cases as each was extremely interested in what our program could do for his people.

One of our most interesting experiences was in Yaracuy State at a land reform settlement named Santa Maria. While meeting with the officers of their farm production cooperative there, we noted with pleasure that in the office were displayed posters depicting the Rochdale principles of cooperatives. We observed sugarcane being cut by hand with machetes and this was the beginning of a most interesting human interest story.

#### LOST GLASSES

Later that day, Arnold Ackermann, my fellow team member from Willmar, Minn., discovered that he had lost his glasses and determined that they must have slipped from his pocket in the sugarcane field while he was wearing his sunglasses. Since this was only the second week of our project in Latin America, the replacement of his glasses as soon as possible was of great concern to him. The cane field was a large one and the cut cane was laying from 8 to 12 inches deep and finding them seemed like an impossible task. However, the next morning at 8 a.m., the president of the

cooperative and a couple of campesinos arrived at our hotel to return his glasses. A large group of campesinos had formed a "callapa" which is similar to our "harvesting bees" in the Midwest. They all got together for no pay and combed every inch of that field until they found the glasses. What a terrifically moving experience this was for all of us to have been extended such friendship and such great assistance. We are attempting to find a candidate for our program from Santa Maria as a gesture of appreciation.

#### EDUCATION

We observed a great deal of fine work being done by the extension service people in Venezuela. Their home demonstration agents are teaching people to make simple furniture for their homes, to boil their water to help prevent disease, and to make room dividers for their homes for a certain amount of family privacy. There are also many handicraft projects, all of which are useful in the home. County agents are beginning to develop 4-H Clubs, which they call 5-V Clubs, and have even had achievement days in some areas. But there is so much work to be done and so little money and people with which to do it.

But I will always remember the determination and impatience on the faces of the campesinos. They know that there are better ways of living and more modern methods of farming. They are going to get these things for themselves in whatever manner they can. If the United States is not willing or able to assist in the development of Latin America, then someone else is, and the time is short. As Theodoro Moscoso, Director of the Alliance for Progress, has said, "It is 1 minute to midnight in Latin America."

#### PUBLIC SERVICE BY MINNEAPOLIS RADIO STATION KDWB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am proud to report that a Minneapolis radio station has performed a magnificent public service—a deed of compassion—which deserves the highest commendation. The station is KDWB, of Minneapolis.

Last Thursday, a brief wire service story came into the KDWB office and newsroom. It told of a 17-year-old Oklahoma boy ill with hemophilia in a Dallas, Tex., hospital, and of his desperate need for blood transfusions.

Station KDWB did more than offer a simple report of the story. Its staff immediately phoned the Dallas hospital, to ask: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?"

The answer—a need for blood donations—brought an immediate and continuing response from KDWB. Through its radio facilities, KDWB urged blood donations by Minnesota citizens. In addition, the station sent some of its own staff members to Dallas, to make blood donations.

The result is that hundreds of pints of blood plasma have been made available for the individual case in Dallas, plus hundreds more for the general blood bank available to others.

I am pleased to note that station KDWB related this effort to the continuing need for blood donations, and stressed the general need for support of the Red Cross blood donor program during the whole year, and particularly during National Red Cross Month, this month.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that this is National Red Cross Month, and again it gives us an opportunity to express our eternal gratitude and appreciation to the Red Cross for all the wonderful work it undertakes and accomplishes. I wish to salute the American Red Cross and also the International Red Cross for their humanitarian activities—for the lives they have saved, for the communities they have helped, and for the encouragement they have given to so many persons. In my opinion, these activities are the finest examples of compassion and humanitarianism.

Mr. President, I also salute the effective public service exhibited in the effort of station KDWB; and I ask that a brief chronology of this effort be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**CHRONOLOGICAL REPORT ON CREATION OF  
KDWB RADIO'S FLIGHT FOR LIFE**

On Thursday, March 7, 1963, a national wire service carried the following story:

"A 17-year-old Oklahoma boy needs help. He needs blood. Fred Wallace is a victim of hemophilia or 'Bleeder's Disease.' Officials at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, Tex., say Wallace has been given more than 800 pints of blood and blood plasma since he entered the hospital last October. This, they believe, is the largest amount of blood received by a single patient in the history of medical transfusion. Wallace is now receiving four transfusions a day. An urgent call is out for voluntary donors. Fred's family has been able to replace only about 250 pints of blood so far."

Upon receipt of this news story KDWB went to work to see what Twin Cities and Minnesotans could do to help this unfortunate family in Texas. KDWB news immediately telephoned Dr. Fred Souls, assistant director of the Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in Dallas and asked: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?" Dr. Souls, in a specially recorded telephone conversation, outlined how people could go to the Red Cross blood bank in St. Paul and donate blood in the name of Fred Wallace.

This tape recording and story were put on the air on KDWB immediately, and immediately interested people started calling the radio station for more information. The story was repeated a couple of more times on Thursday. On Friday morning the St. Paul office of the Red Cross blood bank contacted KDWB for further information on the entire story. It seems a number of people had expressed an interest to them to donate their blood for Fred Wallace in Dallas, Tex.

KDWB's public service director, in talking with Twin City Red Cross officials, realized that this public response to a couple of news stories could mean a lot more; possibly a big public service campaign drawing public attention to (1) Fred Wallace's needs, and (2) the Red Cross blood donor program, during this, National Red Cross Month.

Through KDWB management and Mr. Lou Schaefer at Braniff International Airways, tickets were purchased for six members of the KDWB air staff to fly to Dallas, Tex., and personally donate a pint of blood each to Fred Wallace. Meeting the KDWB air personalities in Dallas will be members of Dallas radio station KBOX and the Dallas Red Cross. (The KDWB personnel leave Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport at 8:35 a.m., Monday, March 11, via Braniff flight 51;

they return Monday evening arriving at 10:30 p.m. in the Twin Cities.)

During the entire time the six KDWB air personalities are flying to Dallas to donate this blood, Louis (Lou) Riegert, another KDWB staff member, will run an all day marathon on the air in the Twin Cities. Throughout the day he will be announcing names of people in Minnesota who have called their local Red Cross blood bank and offered their services as a volunteer worker or offered their blood in hopes of saving somebody's life—possibly Fred Wallace's.

KDWB views this public service campaign as a sort of "domestic people to people friendship," doing, as has been mentioned, two primary things. No. 1, KDWB hopes it will draw national public attention to the Red Cross and their blood program, now during Red Cross Month. No. 2, and equally important, KDWB hopes to play some small part in possibly helping Texas medical men save the life of Fred Wallace.

**STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF  
STATE RUSK ON NUCLEAR TEST  
BAN**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee had met to hear the testimony of our Secretary of State on the very important subject of the U.S. treaty proposals relating to a test ban on nuclear weapons testing.

This subject has been one of great importance, of considerable public interest, and of much controversy.

The Secretary of State appeared before our committee for about 2½ hours. He gave us a prepared statement which I believe is one of the most cogent and well-reasoned statements as to national policy relating to nuclear weapons and the position of this administration relating to agreeing to a nuclear test ban treaty to which I have ever listened.

The Secretary of State is a man of good judgment. He is a prudent man. He is always very careful in his testimony. At the same time, he is thoughtful and persuasive. I am very much impressed with the integrity of the Secretary of State and his grasp of the intricate problems which confront this Nation.

The Secretary of State has to be informed on many issues of both national and international importance. The proposed nuclear test ban treaty is only one of a dozen or more important problems and issues on which he must be informed, yet Dean Rusk demonstrated a mastery of the subject matter of nuclear weapons testing which was nothing short of amazing.

I take this brief moment to commend the Secretary of State and to thank him for the manner in which he explained the position of this administration and, may I say, of the previous administration. He properly pointed out that this was not a matter of partisan debate or even of partisan controversy. He appropriately pointed out that both the previous Eisenhower administration and the present Kennedy administration have endorsed as a matter of national policy the proposals in the form of a treaty which would make possible a prohibition upon further nuclear testing.

The Secretary of State called our attention to improvements in detection of underground nuclear tests. He pointed out in a convincing manner the national interest our country has in obtaining a treaty which would prohibit further tests—I might add, an enforceable treaty, a treaty with safeguards so as to minimize the risks which might be involved in any such arrangement.

The Secretary pointed out, first, that "a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of the slackening the pace of the arms race"; and he documented his statement.

Secondly, he said that "an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States"; and he went on to document that conclusion.

Third, he pointed out that "a primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one." He also said:

I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible.

The Secretary went on to point out how important were the onsite inspections to the United States and, indeed, to the total relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Secretary, with his customary candor, called to our attention the fact that "a test ban would not of itself solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons," but he did say that "a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem."

The Secretary also called to our attention the fact that "a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the Alliance."

This was a remarkable statement, and I believe that in the main it answers many of the criticisms which have been leveled at the proposed nuclear test ban treaty.

The Secretary cited the increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances, thereby permitting us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. He called to our attention the fact that "an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions."

In conclusion, the Secretary cited that it was the considered judgment of the President and of his chief advisers in the national security area "that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance." He also said:

An announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from



the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing.

He believes, and he called to our attention, the fact that "the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States."

The Secretary also said that "the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well-reasoned, brief, thoughtful, and excellently documented statement by our able and conscientious Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk with the committee today about a most important aspect of our foreign policy, our long-continued effort to achieve agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban treaty.

Since the summer of 1958 the U.S. Government has consistently adhered to the view that a safeguarded cessation of nuclear weapons testing would be in our national interest. Periodic policy reviews in the light of shifting patterns of foreign policy, of changes in the negotiating situation, and of technical developments have always produced the same answer: that an effective test ban treaty is in our national interest.

Indeed, it is worth recalling that in 1945-46, at the very birth of the nuclear age, it was clearly perceived that a nuclear arms race would create the greatest dangers for all mankind. Consequently, President Truman directed the most serious and diligent effort to prevent such a race by bringing atomic energy under international control. Unhappily, the Baruch proposals did not succeed.

Today, I would like to discuss a nuclear test ban with you from the standpoint of our relations with the Soviet bloc and with countries outside the bloc, including our allies. I would also like to discuss what I believe to be the basic requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty to be effective. For it is clear that an illusory set of obligations on this sensitive subject ought never to be entered into by the United States.

In my judgment, the conclusion of an effective nuclear test ban treaty would have three advantages of primary importance in our relations with the Soviet Union.

First a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of slackening the pace of the arms race. Once this step had been taken with satisfactory results, new opportunities for further steps toward turning the arms race downward might well be more within the realm of reality than at present. For the past 16 years during which the cold war has been waged, we have experienced the effect of an almost unlimited arms race on our national security and on our position in relation to the Soviet Union in the world arena. Although our position has been preserved and Communist aggression has been effectively deterred to a large extent by the buildup and deployment of our military forces, our security in that position has not necessarily been improved. Indeed, our military position might well be more secure today if we had successfully achieved agreement on a test ban treaty several years ago, earlier in the negotiations.

Because of the extensive history of past negotiations on this particular question, the

narrowing of the issues that has resulted from these negotiations and the worldwide interest, I believe that this problem may be more ripe for solution than perhaps any other first step in the arms control and disarmament field. It is clear that unless at some point we are able to step off in a new direction, the upward spiral of the arms race will continue unabated. The prospects of such a future for both ourselves and the Soviet Union are not attractive.

Second, an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States. At the present time we feel confident in our nuclear capabilities. We have today a stockpile of nuclear weapons which ranges from a few tens of tons of TNT, equivalent to many megatons. These weapons are useful for a variety of strategic and tactical uses. The Soviet Union has a stockpile of its own.

In certain areas of the spectrum of explosive power, namely the extremely large yields, the Soviets have developed weapons for which I am informed we do not have a present military requirement. In other areas, namely in the development of intermediate and lower yield weapons, we believe that we have a more varied arsenal than the Soviet Union. The President and his chief national security advisers, including myself and the Secretary of Defense, believe it doubtful that either side would, through further testing, achieve major advances in any significant area which could be translated into a military advantage without the other side making either a similar or offsetting gain. There is one proposition which we must keep in mind despite confidence and understandable national pride: Nature does not yield up its secrets with political favoritism. The list of Nobel Prize winners in the sciences over the past half century shows that major breakthroughs in knowledge come from many directions and have little to do with national frontiers. If our present assessment of the military situation is correct, and I believe it is, now would be an opportune time from our point of view for the conclusion of a treaty to halt further nuclear weapon testing.

The third primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one. I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible. The Soviet Union has reasons of its own for its penchant for secrecy. Regardless of the merits of their case, however, it is clear that a closed society breeds suspicion and distrust on the part of other nations. Such an atmosphere is not conducive to taking steps to treat the symptoms of international tensions or to come to grips with the causes of these tensions.

A nuclear test ban treaty would obviously not lift the veil of secrecy from the Soviet Union. It would not even result in any substantial opening up of Soviet society. It could, however, have a very important impact on the Soviet attitude toward secrecy, especially as it relates to problems of arms control and disarmament. The carrying out of on-site inspections on Soviet territory would provide the United States with not only the necessary assurance that unidentified seismic signals were not underground nuclear explosions but also additional advantages. If a test ban treaty can operate effectively and in ways which demonstrate that the inspection connected with it does not jeopardize Soviet security or result in any particular embarrassments to the Soviet Union and its people, then the Soviet leadership may be more inclined to enter into other similar agreements. The first step seems to be the most difficult. If it can be made successful then further steps in the same

direction might be taken with less difficulty than the first.

Therefore, in our relations with the Soviet Union I believe that a nuclear test ban treaty would have both political and military advantages. In addition, an effective nuclear test ban would have advantages in our relations with countries outside the Soviet bloc.

Among the dangers to the United States from continued testing by both sides I would consider the danger of the further spread of nuclear weapons to other countries of perhaps primary importance. Unlimited testing by both the United States and the Soviet Union would substantially increase the likelihood that more and more nations would seek the dubious, but what some might consider prestigious, distinction of membership in the nuclear club. The risks to the security of the free world from nuclear capabilities coming within the grasp of governments substantially less stable than either the United States or the Soviet Union are grave indeed.

A test ban would not of itself solve the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It should be recognized that at least one present nuclear power and one power apparently bent on developing nuclear weapons might not be persuaded to subscribe to the test-ban treaty from the outset. However, many potential nuclear powers might at this stage be induced to accede to the treaty.

Moreover, a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem. I am referring here to the possibility of an agreement on the one hand by the nuclear powers not to transfer control of weapons nor to give assistance in weapons development to countries not already possessing them, and on the other, by the nonnuclear powers not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons of their own. Another possibility would be an agreement to halt further production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons and to transfer agreed quantities of such materials to peaceful uses. What should be emphasized here is that while a nuclear test ban by no means offers a total solution, it would be a necessary first step.

What I have just said is, I believe, applicable both to the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons outside the North Atlantic alliance and to the problem of the development of additional national nuclear capabilities by NATO members. I believe that a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the alliance.

Of secondary, but nevertheless significant importance is the problem of radioactive fallout. In large part because of real or assumed dangers from fallout, nuclear testing has become a key political issue in a great many countries around the world. Our relations with those countries are sometimes adversely affected when our tests produce fallout outside our own borders. On the other hand, our initiatives in seeking a test ban agreement have been well received by not only our allies but by the uncommitted countries.

I have pointed out what I believe to be the primary advantages to the United States in an effective nuclear test ban treaty in terms of our relations with the Soviet Union and with other countries around the world. However, I would like to make it clear that I believe there may also be advantages to the Soviet Union in a nuclear test ban.

A certain degree of mutuality of interest is an obvious prerequisite for any agreement.

I have stated that an effective nuclear test ban would be to the military advantage of the United States. This should not exclude the possibility that the Soviet Union could at the same time have valid military reasons

for entering into a nuclear test ban treaty with the intention of carrying it out. The United States and the Soviet Union have to date apparently pursued somewhat different objectives in their testing programs. This difference in emphasis appears attributable to different strategic concepts, as well as technological considerations. Therefore, while we may be assured that our own retaliatory capability in the event of nuclear attack is sufficient to deter such an attack, the Soviet Union could at the same time believe that it has a sufficient nuclear capability for its own security requirements without the need of further testing. Similarly, the possibility of the future spread of nuclear weapons is a legitimate concern not only to ourselves, but to the Soviet Union as well.

I have thus far attempted to demonstrate why and how an effective nuclear test ban treaty would serve the foreign policy interests of the United States. I would now like to address the question of what makes a nuclear test ban treaty effective.

Three requirements are, in my judgment, basic to an effective nuclear test ban treaty.

First, the verification arrangements must provide an adequate deterrent to violation on the part of the Soviet Union. However, no verification system, no matter how elaborate or intrusive, could be foolproof. Therefore, the second requirement of an effective treaty is that the scope of any violation which might escape detection must not be so extensive that it would substantially affect the military balance. Finally, a nuclear test ban treaty will be adhered to only so long as a mutuality of interest in the agreement persists. If the Soviet Union were ever to conclude that a test ban were no longer in its interests, we can be sure that the Soviet leadership would not hesitate to abrogate the treaty and resume testing. Therefore, an effective test ban treaty must not leave the United States in a state of unpreparedness in the event of a Soviet change of attitude.

In my opinion, our present test ban proposals meet these three requirements for an effective treaty.

Last week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of illuminating hearings on developments in the field of detection and identification of nuclear explosions and their relationship to the nuclear test ban negotiations. These hearings explored in considerable depth the scientific and technical basis for the present U.S. position with respect to a nuclear test ban. The efficacy of the technical underpinning for our test ban proposals is certainly an important factor in determining the overall effectiveness of a treaty based on these proposals. However, the effectiveness of the verification arrangements associated with a test ban do not depend entirely upon numbers or locations of detection stations. Nor is any particular number of onsite inspections the key to effectiveness. The verification arrangements must be considered as a totality. The effectiveness of the total system should be judged in the light of the entire geographic, technical, military, political and economic environment in which it would operate.

The increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances permits us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. Moreover, a decrease by a factor of two and one-half in a previous estimate of the number of earthquakes of a given seismic magnitude occurring annually in the Soviet Union has enabled us to reduce the number of onsite inspections on Soviet territory to seven. But perhaps more important than

a particular number of onsite inspections in determining its effectiveness as a deterrent to cheating is the manner in which an onsite inspection would be carried out. Our present position with respect to the number of onsite inspections which would be acceptable to us has, therefore, been very clearly stated by Mr. Foster in discussions with the Soviet representatives to be conditional upon further agreement on such important matters as the method of selecting particular earth tremors for inspection, the size and composition of inspection teams, the area and duration of search, and logistical arrangements. Finally, an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions by vesting control over the installation and operation of the detection network, and control over the carrying out of onsite inspections in the Soviet Union, more completely in the hands of the United States and United Kingdom. This has resulted in a proposal for a simpler and more economical system. It would also permit us to evaluate a greater range of factors in determining whether the Soviet Union was honoring its treaty obligations than would be the case under a treaty providing for more complete international operation and control of the verification system.

I will leave to officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the discussion of the details of this proposal. But it is the conclusion of the President and his chief advisers in the national security area that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance.

Finally, an announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing. Indeed, such a policy would be a deterrent to abrogation and would reinforce the effectiveness of the treaty itself.

In conclusion, I believe that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States, and that the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty. In reaching this conclusion I am aware of the risks involved in an undetected Soviet violation of the treaty or its surprise abrogation. I am also aware, however, of the graver risks to our security and the security of the free world implicit in a future without any multilateral restraint on the development of nuclear weapons. In addition to the risks with and without a test ban which must be carefully weighed against each other, we should also consider the opportunities created by taking a step in the direction of controlling the arms race. I believe that if these new opportunities are placed in the scale, it will be tipped decisively in favor of our present proposals for a ban on the further testing of nuclear weapons.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I know of none—under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1963:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE AMBASSADORS

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somali Republic.

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

##### ENVOY

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

##### U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Proverbs 22: 6: Train a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

Eternal God, who art the Father of our hearts and our homes, in this moment of prayer, we would earnestly beseech Thee that the family and home-life of our beloved country may rise to its sacred shrines of influence and power as it seeks to mold and develop into beauty and strength of character and conduct the children and youth of our day and generation.

Grant that in our high calling as homebuilders, whether living in a castle or cottage, we may strive during this Lenten season to cultivate the fine and congenial virtues and attributes of love and kindness, of considerateness, and thoughtfulness, of peace and joy, so that childhood and youth may not be reared and spent in an atmosphere pervaded and poisoned by contention and discord.

May the children and teenagers learn and practice the noble and necessary art